

THE AMERICAN INDIAN
WHO IS HE?

G. WHITFIELD RAY

LIBRARY

the
university of
connecticut
libraries



E
61
R3

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
LYRASIS members and Sloan Foundation

THE AMERICAN INDIAN — WHO IS HE?



A PORTRAIT OF THE AUTHOR WHEN HE WAS
NOT "AT HOME," BUT DECORATED AND
LIVING AMONG HIS SAVAGES.

THE AMERICAN INDIAN—WHO IS HE?

By

G. WHITFIELD RAY

(By Indian Adoption—"Wan-yam-pan-gap-thling-ithma")

Late Explorer for the Government of Bolivia.
Author of "Through Five Republics on Horseback."

With foreword by "Methewayob," Chief of Chiefs of
the Indian Council Fire.



BOSTON
MEADOR PUBLISHING COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

COPYRIGHT, 1951, BY EDWARD K. MEADOR

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

THE MEADOR PRESS, BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

To my Indian brother and friend, the late

VICE-PRESIDENT CURTIS

who so much desired me to write such a work, but left me for the Happy Hunting Grounds before I had leisure to carry out his wishes, this book is at last affectionately dedicated.

FOREWORD

by "METHEWAYOB" (SCOTT H. PETERS)

Chief of Chiefs, Indian Council Fire

I have carefully read the manuscript of this book and found it to be both interesting and instructive. Dr. Ray knows our race from Alaska to Patagonia, and he has long been recognized as a student of Indian lore, his former book, *Through Five Republics on Horseback*, having had a wide sale.

By adoption the author has become one of us, and is an honorary member of our Council Fire. He is also an F.R.G.S. of England.

We, as Indians, rejoice that such a work as this has been written. We have long regarded the humiliating theory that we are Oriental immigrants as unjust.

We do not believe that our "family tree" was ever rooted in Asia, nor are we in any sense ethnologically connected with the Orient. In all our many Tribes and languages, there is no legend of our having crossed the sea from Asia. Even the western tribes of our people have no such folklore or tradition.

We have our own pride of race.

This is the land where our fathers have lived from time immemorial. Deep in this soil lie their bones. All our legends and ballads, coming down from dim antiquity, point to no other soil as our fatherland. Nor did we dream that there was any other.

When, in 1492, the Pale Faces discovered our continent, hidden in the center of two oceans, we received them with kindness. We fought them when they ruthlessly stole our lands and killed our animal food.

We are not ashamed of our war with the Pale Face. We battled for our own. We are given the blame, but yours, white reader, is the shame.

The intruders were too strong for us. We lost the flower of our manhood. They are now in the "Happy Hunting Grounds." Let it be remembered that we fought always on our own ground. True history shows that we were as chivalrous as our enemies.

We wish now to live in peace with the Pale Face, but to keep sacred the memory of our own people. We are willing to forgive and forget the past and smoke the Pipe of Peace together.

We realize that in order to survive we must now learn the ways and speech of the newcomers who call themselves "*Americans*"—at which we smile.

We crave a deeper recognition of our rights as the original owners of this soil, a more ethical handling of our affairs by the Government, and a more just recognition of our claims. A better education of our children would show us to be capable of taking our places with the Pale Faces of today.

In the Land of the Sky-Blue Waters, while yet my birch-bark cradle swung in the breeze, my Chippewa parents named me "*The Bow*." As a "bow," I wish to speed the arrow of this book on its way, that white men and women may know more of the unremembered ages of our past history; that misconceptions regarding our race may be righted; and that posterity may see us in a truer light.

From our Council Fire we send the book. It is "good medicine." May the Great Spirit use it!

METHEWAYOB
(SCOTT H. PETERS)

Chief of Chiefs,
Indian Council Fire.

PREFACE

The author of this book has lived with various tribes of American Indians from Alaska to Patagonia, and given much study to their unique ethnological characteristics.

During the last decade it has been his privilege to lecture to all classes on the Indians, and he has noted the uniformity of belief that the Red Man is of Asiatic origin. This theory has obtained credence far and wide and to an extraordinary extent. Parrot-like, all repeat the same words. It has been rare indeed to find an individual of independent thought. Students and laymen, authors and scientists, when asked to give reasons for such a belief, reply "I do not know," or "It is usually considered to be so," etc. One prominent scientist, pressed to give his reasons for such belief, would only say "It is generally so believed." The author finds that most of such men, for various reasons, do not care to commit themselves. Strange to hold tenaciously to a view and not be able (or willing) to give a reason therefor! To say "It is so 'because' it is so!" is generally supposed to be the prerogative of the fair sex! Facetiously at that!

Such constant reiteration would be amusing if it were not so pathetic. The paucity of original thought is deplorable.

It is indeed strange that such an unscientific conclusion as the one under discussion should not have been more frequently challenged by the thoughtful. It is sad that so many things should be just taken for granted and so many preconceived notions accepted without thought or questioning.

The first modern novelist by a thoughtless slip (or was the "printer's devil" responsible?) portrayed his hero as

having an "olive" complexion; and now every novelist, through that "slip which passed in the night" uses the same erroneous expression! Millions of readers never pause to think that "olive" is a *green* shade. An "olive" colored man would be as interesting as a *purple* cow!

That there is neither rhyme nor reason, logic or even probability in the generally-accepted theory of the immigration of the Indian, it is the purpose of this book to prove.

It has been written in the hope that its pages will throw some light upon the "vexed question" of the lineage and source of the first inhabitants of America. In it have been given many quotations from the writings of the highest authorities, in this and other lands, in proof of our assertion that these long-misunderstood people are *not* emigrants from Asia, but are a race of Americans who have been here from time immemorial, and that they are an unrelated stock.

The indolent of mind too long have followed age-old ideas for which there is no warrant in fact.

We shall seek to show, and adduce various arguments for our contention, that the assumption that the American Indian originally came from Asia is totally without foundation; that the idea was born of geographical ignorance; and that there is no foundation for the belief except the sayings of men, the antiquity of custom, or deference to the multitude of those who consider it to be a fact! Nevertheless, it has now become a cast-iron figure of speech—accepted by millions whose ideas on the subject are but "heir-looms."

As a nation we have paid the bills for, or done the work of archeological research in the Orient; but have ignored our own fields—where one-tenth part of the money expended would have been sufficient to unearth marvellous relics of ancient America! The average American does not believe much in "ruins" unless they're across the Atlantic.

The motto "See America First" should be impressed

upon all who would cross the seas to other lands. It is deeply to be regretted that thus far it isn't "fashionable" to visit such interesting places as Palenque, Uxmal and Cuzco. Professor Ross of the University of Wisconsin says:—"One day, surely, Cuzco will be a great goal of pilgrimage like Rome, Jerusalem or Cairo."

We know more of Egyptian history than we do of our own!

The author has travelled in Eastern lands with educated Americans who can reel off pages of history regarding Caesar's Wars, and speak in glowing terms of the glories of *Luxor*, but have never read of the marvelous conquests of Mexico and Peru, or explored their equally-amazing ruins! Those same Americans will smile incredulously at the mention of *Pyramids in Mexico*, but such exist none the less!

It is earnestly hoped that the Indian and his past greatness may be better understood, and more fully appreciated, through this present humble contribution to his history.

This book is called for. The Indians are the author's friends, and it is in their interests and at their desire that it is being penned. The author, it may be mentioned, has been honored by being "adopted" into their Tribes. They are, largely, an inarticulate people—a ravaged race whose identity has been misunderstood; a tribe whose beginnings were in the dateless past.

We shall seek to show that the Atlantic man—whose existence was never even dreamt of before 1492, is as truly a product of America as the llama of the animal world and the corn of the vegetable world.

Emerging from the wilderness of indifference regarding the Red Man, thoughtful ethnologists are now seeing him as an original stock—the only pure-blooded race on the earth! At long last his tribe is being recognized as a separate people, and has been given the distinctive name "Amerind." Of late it has begun to dawn on men's minds that there is nothing so very sacrosanct about a decision or

pronunciamento merely because it is *ancient*. Strange that four hundred years had to elapse before ethnologists began to feel that a new name ought to be given to this "Trans-Atlantic" man! After much discussion, the name of "Amerind" was selected (contraction of "American" and "Indian" respectively)—although it was admitted that there was nothing "Indian" in the Red Man!

The "Red Man" was *misnamed* in the first place, and through misunderstanding and erroneous classification has been denied acknowledgment of his true and separate identity. Calling him "Asian" did not solve the enigma of his ancestry; and it is the purpose of the present author to clarify the matter and place the "Red Man" in his real ethnological "niche."

Free use has been made of the "findings" of authors in this and other countries, and quotations from their writings accurately given and acknowledged. Grateful acknowledgment is here made of the assistance received from the now deceased Dr. Oliver Perry Hay—who was regarded as the world's foremost paleontologist of his day—and of the information furnished in correspondence with Dr. Hay's daughter, who so inspired him in his labors. The author also expresses his deep appreciation to Professor Sylvanus G. Morley of the Carnegie Institute of Washington (and head of the Chichen-Itza Project) and to Dr. Spinden of the Brooklyn Museum, for their encouragement and helpful suggestions in the preparation of this work; also to those who have perused the manuscript and urged its publication. Grateful acknowledgment is also made of many cultured "Amerinds"—whose "mouthpiece" he is happy to be in the penning of this book.

To quote the words of another, "I propose to give here some of my reasons for my findings. If you agree with me and read this, I shall be pleased, but if you disagree with me and read on nonetheless, I shall be overjoyed, because then I shall have a chance to accomplish one of the

most difficult things in the world—namely to persuade a fellow human being to change his own mind.”

This contribution to a new line of thought is sent forth in hope.

Of you who read, the request is made that—laying aside all preconceived ideas and beginning from “scratch”—you carefully examine the “pros” and the “cons” of the question under discussion, in order to discover if the former belief, despite the tenacity of its hold on the minds of men, should not now be relegated to the limbo of things as obsolete as the “Santa Maria” which precipitated the question “Whence came the American Indian?”

G. WHITFIELD RAY.

Geneva, Ill.

“And Nature, the old nurse, took
The child upon her knee,
Saying “Here is a story-book
Thy Father hath written for thee.”

“Come, wander with me,” she said,
“Into regions yet untrod,
And read what is still unread
In the manuscripts of God.”

Longfellow.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Foreword	7
Preface	9
CHAPTER I	
The Quest for Asian Shores	19
CHAPTER II	
Unveiling a Strange Land	28
CHAPTER III	
Mundus Novus	36
CHAPTER IV	
The Discovery of America from Asia	51
CHAPTER V	
The Red Man is not a Yellow Man	76
CHAPTER VI	
Was the Spring Board in Europe?	97
CHAPTER VII	
The Universal Creation	106
CHAPTER VIII	
The Legendary Jewish Creation Story	120
CHAPTER IX	
Evolution and the "Color Scheme"	141
CHAPTER X	
The Rise of New World Man	157
CHAPTER XI	
The Search for the Non-Existent	179

CHAPTER XII

An Old World and an Old Humanity	196
--	-----

CHAPTER XIII

The Amerind: The Only Man on Earth Who is not an Immigrant!	217
--	-----

CHAPTER XIV

Mexico	238
--------------	-----

CHAPTER XV

The Mayas	251
-----------------	-----

CHAPTER XVI

The Discovery of Peru	272
-----------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XVII

An Unknown People in an Unknown Land	294
--	-----

THE AMERICAN INDIAN — WHO IS HE?

The American Indian—Who is He?

CHAPTER I

THE QUEST FOR ASIAN SHORES

"The fair breeze blew, the white foam flew
The furrow followed free;
We were the first that ever burst
Into that silent sea."

"The Ancient Mariner."

Christianity, which in the first centuries of its era had gone from conquering to conquer the souls of men, lost its spiritual force as it took on temporal power. Christian nations stagnated. A more dynamic religion then arose with Mohammed as its leader. Once Christian nations turned Moslem. The "Seven Churches of Asia" became Mohammedan Mosques, France and Spain were conquered by Islam, and it was even touch and go whether the Koran or the Bible would be taught in Oxford. Europe's Dark Ages were dark indeed. Mohammedan nations grew learned and powerful and finally forbade Christian States to trade with the East. At this crucial time, from the land of the Caesars there came to the Iberian Peninsula a personality who was to be the guiding star of fate to lift Spain and all Europe out of its 1,000 years of decay and poverty. His name was Christopher Columbus.

Columbus had visited the Azores, and believed that land existed still further westward. He suspected that the world was round—or rather globular—and naturally reasoned that if one went far enough he must eventually reach the

regions of the Great Khan, to which Moslem vessels then sailed by going eastward.

This belief became an obsession with him, and thenceforth his life was dedicated to carrying out his project of discovering a new way to Asia.

Queen Isabella of Spain, the most enterprising of all European royalty, listened attentively to the plans and pleas of this Italian, examined his far-from-perfect maps, and finally pawned her jewels and risked her wealth in order to outfit the daring mariner on his venturesome quest.

His avowed purpose was "From the Occident to the Orient I will find a path through the waters."

Columbus estimated that the circumference of the earth was about fifteen thousand miles, as was believed in those days, and if Asia occupied two-thirds of it (as assumed by Marco Polo), it was very natural for him to reason that if he sailed some three thousand miles westward he would then arrive at its fringe.

After 71 days of anxious sailing, ever westward from Palos, 71 evenings of seeing the sun sink into the waste of waters ahead of them, the Admiral began looking for land, and soon the mariners thought that they saw twinkling lights! The "dream" had become a "gleam"! Was it just imagination? Could it be some ignis fatuus that was luring them on to destruction? Nay, for now they could see from the deck of the "Santa Maria" "the lights along the shore"!

According to knowledge at that time, this land could be nothing else than Asia. The seamanship cannot be questioned—the whole misconception lay in the fact that the globe was not 15,000 miles in circumference as Columbus thought, but was nearly 25,000 miles. The globe of Columbus was but a globule!

This discovery has been styled the most dramatic incident in the secular history of mankind.

Did any of those seamen sleep, think you? Could the great Admiral lose consciousness in slumber on such a mem-

orable night as this when realization was crowning his high hopes? There before him was the solid earth—the consummation of his quest! He had been mocked and flouted; but he had felt in the depths of his being that if he could but cross that “Sea of Darkness” his dream would merge into reality. Those gleaming camp-fire lights shining out of the darkness across the waves were the most welcome sight his eyes had ever beheld! The happiest land-fall in all history had now taken place, and Columbus devoutly gave God thanks for that “light at eventide.”

We can well imagine that when out of the empty waste of waters behind them the sun arose and poured forth its radiance, every man was ready and eager to step on to the enchanted land before them.

The island first sighted by Columbus was “Guanahani,” which he renamed “San Salvador.” We are glad that the birth-day is known; but are sad that the birth-place has been lost sight of. San Salvador should have been marked in some way and memorialized to perpetuity.

As Hawthorne writes:—“Among human events nothing so wonderful and inspiring has ever been witnessed as the uplifting of the darkness and the revelation of the dawn on that October morning!” Sunrise for the land. Sunset for the inhabitants.

Never before was boat so gladly launched by eager hands, and when it touched the silver strand, Columbus knelt in devout thanksgiving, and we may be sure that every mariner likewise bent the knee in gratitude and awe.

A wag has said that “The Spaniards fell on their knees and then on the aborigi-nees,” but that is not quite true of the first voyagers. Columbus was a kind and humane man.

After the act of piety above referred to, the wondering natives were induced to come forward and accept gifts.

Washington Irving writes: “The world is an inn of strange meetings; and this encounter is perhaps the strangest of all. No other paragraph in the vast story of mankind possesses so rich an interest.”

What must have been the emotions of those mariners when they first beheld the bizarre aborigines, so unlike any humans they had ever known before! Wonder, astonishment, awe and exultation must have taken possession of every member of the crew. Similarly what emotions must have filled those simple Caribs as they beheld the winged ships of the bearded men and the strange-colored countenances of those creatures from the dim unknown!

We read that the Spanish mariners on that eventful landing saw "a multitude of men and women and children of cinnamon hue, unlike any kind of people they had ever seen."

In his *Natural History* Lawrence observes "The Spaniards did not find a single animal they were acquainted with, not one of the quadrupeds of Europe, Asia or Africa."

Prescott writes: "And man was equally strange—in complexion, language and institutions."

When Columbus discovered what he thought were the outlying coasts of India, naturally he concluded that the natives he found inhabiting them were Indians; but as their color, physiognomies and whole characteristics differentiated them from the Indians the Europeans had seen before, they called them "*Red*" Indians.

The fact is noteworthy that from the first Columbus and his followers never called the Indians "Chinese" or thought of them as being Mongolian people—but always as "Indios." Well could they see that there was no similarity between those aborigines and the Yellow Men.

Sea-faring Spaniards had seen Negroes of Africa and East Indians, but the aborigines of the "New-found-land" were beings apart.

Of the first discovery of the Red Men, Spanish annals are full and the records are complete. Their wonderment at beholding "*Indios Rojos*" fills many a page of 16th Century literature. To us it is now an old story; but naturally to those who first encountered the "*Amerind*," so unlike the rest of mortals, he was the marvel of marvels.

Certain that his voyage would take him to the Orient, Columbus had been careful to carry with him men who spoke Arabic, Hebrew and Chaldaic respectively (the last mentioned language being presumably that spoken in Eden); but when they tried those tongues on the "Red Men," they discovered that no idiom of the Old World would suffice to bridge the gulf separating the two races. As we shall endeavor to show in a subsequent chapter, American languages are of a totally different order from every other.

Returning to his ship, Columbus made an entry in his diary as follows:—"As soon as I arrived in the Indies . . . where I intended to go ———." So sure was Columbus that he had reached the Indies that a notary public was sent around to the crews of the three ships, and every man was required to sign a formal document setting forth that the land before them was "the beginning and end of Asia, by which anyone might return overland to Spain; by pursuing the coast of which he would soon arrive among civilized people." They all declared, under oath, that they had no doubt as to the truth of this document.

Considering the colossal ignorance of geography in those days, it was a reasonable and justifiable assumption that the Spanish ships had reached the extreme eastern seaboard of Asia—but *why India?* Surely Columbus knew that China lay farther east from Europe? We can only surmise that he noticed the native people he found were more of the East Indian than the Mongolian type, and that he therefore wisely concluded that China lay farther north. As yet no European ship had ever touched China.

Leaving San Salvador, Columbus cruised around, and in the translucent atmosphere of the tropics sighted more islands, each with its quota of painted natives.

Singling out certain promontories of Cuba which he took to be Japanese (it would thus seem he did not know Japan was east of China), he called them the Alpha and the Omega—the beginning and the ending—of Asia.

We must bear in mind the fact that Columbus, when urging the claims of his mission to the Spanish Crown, expressed his fervent desire to rescue the Holy Sepulchre from the Infidel. When he landed in Cuba, he thought it was Japan—yet believed himself to be in Indian waters. He carried letters of greeting to the Great Khan of Tartary. When, later on, he explored the Island of Trinidad, he quoted all kinds of "authorities" (?) to prove that he was close to Armenia—that he had found the terrestrial Paradise, "The Apex of the World," and that the river Orinoco was one of those rivers mentioned in the Book of Genesis.

Quite naturally Columbus was eager to return to Spain with the glad tidings of the success of his mission; and when he arrived there, the tale of his discoveries aroused intense excitement.

The Red Indians ("Indios Rojos") that Columbus took back with him to show to Queen Isabella were proudly displayed, as were the parrots and a few pieces of gold. The parrots were beautiful, but the Spaniards had seen such birds before; while as for the gold—even the peasants had admired that yellow metal around the neck of "Our Lady" in Church. For a *maravedi* they had even been permitted to kiss the rings of gold upon her fingers—but the "INDIOS ROJOS"—that was another matter! We read that "They were objects of intense interest, who were regarded with as much astonishment as if they had been citizens of another planet, so different were they from any race of men hitherto known."

The discoverers described all the natives of the new land as being different from other men in that their skins were "rojo" or "red," a race of men quite unlike any of the people with whom they were acquainted in the Old World—an "American" type of mankind as clearly distinctive as those types which we call Caucasian or Ethiopian. The Spanish Parliament found them "passing strange in color and different from any other people seen before."

How Mr. Barnum of circus fame must have regretted

that scoop! Hundreds of years later, he made thousands of dollars taking Red Men to Europe; but by then everyone knew that they existed. Time had dulled the wonder. Pictures of the Red Man were in all the school books.

Someone is credited with saying "When Columbus left Spain, he did not know where he was going; when he got 'there' he did not know where he was; and when he returned he did not know where he had been!" As we view the expedition now, with our fuller information, that may be the case; but as Columbus saw it, he was bound for the East; he most assuredly arrived in the East; and on his return to Spain had an unshaken conviction that he had been in the Orient. Hence he called the natives that he found there "Indians." Moreover, the world of men in Europe was just as profoundly convinced that the same sea whose waves dashed against their western coast, laved the shores of Asia.

But it *was* possible to sail west and yet go east. The world *was* round.

We laud the great Christopher. Before the astonished eyes of Europe he laid open a new path as truly as if someone should now open up a way to the moon.

The way to the mystic East was opened. The terrors of the Atlantic had been braved. "Christoforo Colombo" was the pathfinder who had dared the unknown and won the prize. He had reached Asia's back door!

The discovery of another route to the East stirred all Europe. Church bells pealed solemnly forth. "Solemn Te Deums" were chanted, and everywhere the great discoverer was lauded to the skies. Riches and glory were his.

Columbus had sold a *round* earth to a bigoted people who believed in a flat earth.

The voyage of the "Shyppe of Fooles" can have no parallel in the whole career of mankind. No other man can dream such golden dreams, and then find them so amazingly real.

Documents recently found in Genoa indicate that the

expedition cost Spain \$8,000—so the “interest returns” haven’t been so bad!

It is noticeable that no one thought of giving to this newly found Eden, the name “Columbus,” for the reason that it already had two good names “Asia” and “The Indies.”

At this point let due honors be given to the Norsemen also. The dragon ships of Leif Ericson five hundred years earlier had braved the Atlantic, and he along with other adventurers of his day had landed on some northern part of North America.

Oh, yes, they did land. We have proof of it. Steffanson found fair-haired Eskimos.

You can count the apples on a tree, but can you count the trees in one apple?

The “Dark Ages” when the Vikings ruled the seas were too dark to reap results of the probably-accidental earlier discovery. Their half-mythical voyages live only in sagas. As Mark Twain facetiously observed—“The country did not *stay* discovered.”

The Norsemen preceded Columbus and to them we must raise the cup Skoel! However, the America of today is clearly the outcome of the discovery by Columbus; and it is from that time that we date the end of the old and the beginning of the new.

But, in his discovery Columbus made enemies. There were clerics who retired in seclusion to read again of “the foundations of the world” and its “corner stones,” and they held up their hands in horror and incredulity at the audacity, not to say irreverence, of this Genoese voyager recounting his experiences in Asian waters when Holy Writ declared the earth was flat.

The Church in those days was a mighty power. Free thought was strangled. Learning was confined to the cloister and to religious teachings.

The geography of the Church was that popularly supposed to be that taught in the Book of Job and the Psalms

of David—that the earth was a flat surface held up at the four corners.

The Fundamentalists succeeded in reaching the ears of Isabella. There is no hatred so deep as that of those who believe the literal word of Scripture against those who accept a broader view. No strife is so bitter as are the quarrels of religionists. Columbus was yet to pay dearly for showing Job to be in the wrong.

COLUMBUS

“Were *you* at Salamanca? No.
 We fronted there the learning of all Spain,
 All their cosmogonies, their astronomies:
 Guess-work they guess’d it, but the golden guess
 Is morning-star to the full round of truth.
 No guess-work! I was certain of my goal:
 Some thought it heresy that would not hold.
 King David call’d the heavens a hide, a tent
 Spread over earth, and so this earth was flat:
 Some cited old Lactantius: could it be
 That trees grew downward, rain fell upward, men
 Walk’d like the fly on ceilings? And besides
 The great Augustine wrote that none could breathe
 Within the zone of heat; so might there be
 Two Adams, two mankinds, and that was clean
 Against God’s Word: thus was I beaten back,
 And chiefly to my sorrow by the Church
 And thought to turn my face from Spain:—appeal
 Once more to France or England; but our Queen
 Recall’d me, for at last Their Highnesses
 Were half-assured this earth might be a sphere.”

Tennyson.

CHAPTER II

UNVEILING A STRANGE LAND

“While the planets sang together
At this old world’s birth
Beauty loosed her golden fetters—
Wing’d her way to earth.
Hither, thither, free she rambled
Over sea and land;
Aimlessly she gaily wandered
To far Carib’s strand.”

Loaded with honors galore, the “Admiral of the Ocean Seas” once more sailed westward, bearing letters of greeting to the Oriental Potentates he surely expected to meet.

The “Mare Tenebrosum” no longer was a “Sea of Darkness” and of terror—it was now a shining silver trail. In a very real sense, Columbus had been its discoverer.

The second arrival of the Spaniards was not to be only a chance visit, as the probably-accidental landing of the Norsemen had been, centuries previously, in more northern latitudes. This time the country was to be conquered as well as discovered. The natives were to be dispossessed of their princely heritage.

When Guanahani became Holy Saviour, it became the White Man’s possession. Apparently it was not destined to be the perpetual inheritance of its original owners.

When bearded aliens found the Caribs, the race died. The ancient law of life began to function. The weak gave place to the strong.

Out of an unknown sphere had they emerged, but only to be annihilated, for the magic power of the bearded “gods” was irresistible.

Upon this second voyage to the Orient, there were carried piles of slave-chains. Five hundred of the natives—"Whose color was that of the devil"—were captured and manacled. Loads were forced on them and gold-hunts were commenced.

Imagine the deep dismay of those trusting souls when they learned—as they did all too soon—that their "gods" had "feet of clay" and "hearts of brass!"

From these Edenic Islands of aromatic fragrance and beauty superb, Spanish ships were to transport them from their ancient fatherland to European slave-marts, where they were helpless as a beetle impaled on a needle. The first slave ship to carry these Caribs was called "Jesus." From her topmast, above a mountain of snowy canvas, floated the red and gold banner of Castile, and above this a crucifix was mounted. While a picture of our Lady of Sorrows was painted on the ballooning mainsail.

Another Spanish ship bore the name "Cinco Llagas" (Five wounds), suggesting the five wounds of Jesus. Its sails were "fanned by the wings of the Holy Ghost."

As soon as the on-rushing stream of European civilization, which was then dawning on the world, was turned westward, the natives were doomed.

For them two or three decades of inhuman treatment remained. For the others later discovered, there was a longer night of hopeless misery before their final extinction.

The West Indian Islands were thickly populated when Columbus found them. Today the inhabitants are all imported Africans. The Caribs have long been extinct. Twenty-five years after the conquest, all the natives of Eastern Brazil also had melted away, and as early as 1580, ten thousand African Slaves had been imported.

From the second voyage of the Spaniards we date the beginning of what Charles Kingsley describes as "cruelties and miseries unexampled in the history of Christendom, or perhaps on earth, save in the conquests of Sennacherib or J inghis-Khan." Literally millions of the aborigines per-

ished from the rigor of the forced-labor of the mines; and this continued absolutely unchecked until 1537—when the oft-repeated wail “Ni thlaca” (“We are also human”) grew so loud that it sounded across the seas and came to the ears of the Pope, and by a special Papal Bull he declared “Indians are human beings with souls, susceptible to conversion.”

Such was the sequence of events; but all of this is now in the limbo of the forgotten past.

While Columbus was further exploring the new coast, inquiring and seeking for gold, another Spanish ship arrived, which he employed as the first mail boat on its return to Europe.

It is significant that the first letter ever written from the New World to the Old was penned by the Admiral himself from Jamaica, whereof an excerpt reads: “He who possesses it (gold) does what he will in this life; and, nay, it even enables him to draw souls from purgatory to heaven.”

Had Columbus only suspected it, he had much more stupendous news to send home than data about birds and trees or even gold! Any tourist could write of such! He had lifted the veil that had been over three-fourths of the world!

While the search for gold was progressing, yet another ship landed, bearing news that the Admiral was to be arrested, and sent, over his Atlantic, back to Spain, bound in ignominious chains. The clerics had succeeded. But he was saved from the Inquisition. Columbus died poor and neglected, and unaware of the fact that to him had been given the incomparable honor of discovering half a world theretofore unknown! Strange that glory and neglect should so often go hand in hand.

As we write his last lineal descendant has been murdered in war-torn Spain.

In 1513 the intrepid Balboa, one of the newcomers, strolled a few miles inland, and to his consternation and wonder beheld through the opalescent haze *another sea*. The expanse of waters which his eyes gazed upon from

that "Peak in Darien" he called "The South Sea." It was a natural inference on his part because that point of land from which he looked faced the south. When—in the name of God and the Pope and the regnant powers of Spain, Balboa with sword uplifted took possession of it and all its coasts—"to all eternity"—he showed himself to be a true Iberian. Those were great days when swelling words of vanity were the vogue.

Balboa must have been sorely perplexed by this strange discovery. Where he not unnaturally expected Asia to extend indefinitely over the horizon to Europe, he had FOUND MORE SEA! Did an inkling of the truth cross his mind? Was he, after all, only on one of the many islands guarding the coast of the Orient? Was Columbus in error in thinking that Cuba was the Kingdom of Japan? Could the boundless expanse of waters which he now gazed upon with such rapt wonder be the sea reported to lie between China and Japan? Was the Continent of spices still further westward across those reaches whose bounds he was unable to scan? Those are questions which no man now may answer.

Twenty-seven years after the first landing of Columbus, Magellan, a Portuguese, sailing southward in the Atlantic, rounded the land which Columbus had discovered and sailed into the sea Balboa had sighted.

"There are no charts for ships that
follow dreams."

To his amazement he discovered that the "South Sea" of Balboa was not a sea but an OCEAN—the largest body of water on this planet! The Pacific Ocean covers a greater area of the surface of the earth than do all the continental lands and islands combined! That daring mariner sailed his painted ships on that painted ocean, studded with islands innumerable, inhabited by lotus-eaters, a veritable *dolce far niente* "Eden"—the fairyland of all creation! The name "South Sea" was seen to be a misnomer, for it extended in-

definitely northward also, so it was altered to "Pacific" and "Sea" changed to "Ocean."

Until that voyage no European or Asian had ever suspected the existence of such a vast expanse of water as the Pacific proved to be. As an example in passing of how old expressions and oft-repeated but erroneous ideas cling to mankind, be it noted that the Hawaiian Islands, although distinctly in the *northern* hemisphere, are still referred to as "*South Sea Islands*."

It has been stated that Magellan detached America and gave it an independent existence, but that is only correct as regards the southern continent. His voyage around the world had not taken him into extreme-northern Pacific waters; and it was still believed that the newly-found twin Continents were connected with Asia in the north.

The Old World was a unit, made up of three Continents merging into one. It was therefore very natural to suppose that as Africa and Asia and Europe were connected, this new land would likewise be joined to the rest of the earth. The separate Continent of Australia had not then been dreamed of; and an entirely unrelated portion of the world was beyond their conception.

Incidentally Magellan also discovered that from the shores of the newly-found land to the real India was a voyage of many weeks' duration, that the real Cathay was at least eight thousand miles from the imagined Cathay of Columbus. The terrestrial globe had increased to more than twice the proportions which cosmographers had dreamed it had!

In those days geographers must have become very much confused.

The Continent on which Columbus thought he had landed was still far distant. His long terrible journey across the "Sea of Darkness" had been only one-third of the way to the land of his dreams.

He never conceived of the existence of such an ocean as the Pacific. He lived and died in the belief that the islands

which he had discovered were contiguous to the shores of Asia.

In the meantime, Americus Vespucci (another Italian) was exploring the mainland to the South—which he rightly concluded was a Continent.

Americus was a man of superior enlightenment; and on his return to Europe he wrote a graphic account of his explorations, stating that he had actually found a separate Continent. His writing so captured the imaginations of his readers that the work was translated into German by Martin Waldseemuller. In his enthusiasm over the wonderful exploits of the author being translated, the German (doubtless over a glass of foaming brew) christened the newly-found Continent "Americus." On a map—naturally far from perfect—which he drew to illustrate the book, the new name was first printed. Thus the nameless world—nameless since its beginning—was designated "America." This appellation was "made in Germany" and an obscure Italian, who simply followed in the path where another had led, was in such an inconsequential way as this given the lasting honor denied to the actual discoverer.

The name "America" was, however, bestowed only upon the Southern Continent—which was found to be connected by a narrow neck of land with the more northerly portion.

Balboa had proved that "America" (this southern portion) was washed by a boundless sea on its western coast. The land north of the strait was still considered to be Asia.

Spain had but little fancy for the bleak lands north of Mexico. There was no gold there ready to be appropriated! Notwithstanding Balboa's discovery of the Pacific, it was still believed that somewhere in the north the new land *must* abutt on Asia. That was a certainty. How else account for the people Columbus had found dwelling there?

The then-recently-invented printing presses of Europe rolled out reams of newly-invented paper, containing in a dozen languages the marvelous story of outer Asian shores

—which were eagerly perused by all who could read. That meant very few other than the clergy.

A grateful people may yet call the Northern Continent "Ericson" and the Southern "Columbus" as a perpetual memorial to their discoverers. Even if Lief Ericson was wafted here by contrary winds and Columbus thought that he had landed on the shores of India, both men "blundered" into fadeless immortality. The names "Indian" and "America" are both accidents of history, but the latter will probably endure for all time. The coined word "Amerind" has now taken the place of "American Indian" and should be universally adopted.

A century and a half rolled by. In that time every writer of history or fiction considered the northern land as being part of the great Asian Continent and all its inhabitants as Oriental people. Hundreds of old books containing accounts of those far eastern shores are still extant.

During that time the Cabots (more Italians) were sent from England and explored the coasts of the northern land, which they regarded as eastern territory, and, whether Chinese or not, England took possession thereof.

Meantime, in 1620, the "Pilgrim Fathers" settled on the northeastern coast, which for aught they knew might be part of Mongolia, for it was assuredly an extension of Asia.

Cartier left Europe and landed in Canada, but called it La Chine (China).

In that one hundred and fifty years the supposed relationship of America and its people to Asia and its people had become deeply fixed in men's minds. Nothing had disturbed such belief. Five generations of people drank it in as a sacred tenet with their mother's milk, and thus it got into the blood.

The old belief still persisted, for over 300 years later, when President Jefferson ordered Lewis and Clark to cross the continent westward, he gave them letters to "Our Consuls in Batavia," seemingly unaware of the fact that Batavia

was 8,000 sea miles from America's west coast. Even today, 450 years since the discovery of America, our scientists still regard Asia and America as connected, though now they naively persuade themselves that their belief is not for geographical, but for ethnological reasons. This insistence is patently nothing more than the ghost of the old stubborn persuasion of pre-Magellan days.

COLUMBUS

“The first discoverer starves—his followers all
 Flower into fortune—our world's way—and I
 Without a roof that I can call mine own,
 With scarce a coin to buy a meal withal
 And seeing what a door for scoundrel scum
 I open'd to the West, thro' which the lust
 Villainy, violence, avarice, of your Spain
 Pour'd in on all those happy naked Isles
 Their kindly native princes slain or slaved
 Their wives and children Spanish concubines,
 Their innocent hospitalities quench'd in blood,
 Some dead of hunger, some beneath the scourge,
 Some over-labor'd, some by their own hands,—
 Yea, the dear mothers, crazing Nature, kill
 Their babies at the breast for hate of Spain.
 Ah, God, the harmless people whom we found
 In Hispaniola's island Paradise!
 Who took us for the very Gods from Heaven
 And we have sent them very fiends from Hell!
 And I myself, myself not blameless, I
 Could sometimes wish that I had never led the way!”

Tennyson.

CHAPTER III

MUNDUS NOVUS

"If the books agree with the Koran," said the Caliph, "they are superfluous; if they contradict it, they are damnable; in either case destroy them!"

Not until 1648 when Deschnew sailed from the East was it discovered that the new land was an immense island, and was in no sense a portion of Asia. This was a vast surprise.

Deschnew is the man who "cut the Gordian knot," and gave America an independent existence. Until his time, no one seems to have had the faintest idea that another *Continent* had been discovered, although the name "America" had gradually been applied to the northern continent as well as to the southern.

When tidings of Deschnew's discovery reached Europe, the Church was appalled, and slow to believe it. It was unwelcome news. It just could not be true! It did not coincide with their religious ideas. That there could be a "world within a world" seemed utterly unbelievable. It was an attempt, they thought, to deny the sacred teaching that all living creatures had migrated from Ararat and been scattered throughout Asia, Europe and Africa.

The religious conscience was not willing to accept it. Frequently that which we do not desire to believe is rejected.

Historians inform us that for many years Deschnew's voyage was regarded as fabulous. The human mind was not ready to receive such a revolutionary idea after being taught otherwise for so long.

Notwithstanding the unbelief and the opposition of the clergy of that day, the record of Deschnew's voyage was substantiated and had to be believed.

Here was a detached continent with an independent existence. Believe it or not! Deschnew was execrated!

"The "Admiral of the Ocean Seas" had (unwittingly) found an undreamed-of western hemisphere, lying between Europe and Asia, a separate unit of the earth, entirely severed from the rest of the world by sundering seas north, south, east and west, a trans-marine world in itself, a Continent stretching from Pole to Pole, wide as the Atlantic Ocean, inhabited by millions of people, and alive with every species of wild life!

In very truth the breezes of the Atlantic had wafted them into a sea of islands utterly unknown, and the almost-divine voyage had revealed the existence of a formerly-hidden world—as large as Europe and Africa combined!

Those first mariners had not the slightest conception of the world-significance of their achievement.

The "Santa Maria" had butted into an intervening world, a Continent midway between two Oceans. How could Columbus be expected to know of its existence, or to be aware of the fact that from San Salvador to Asia's nearest shore there yet intervened a distance of nine thousand miles, more than twice the length of the journey he had travelled?

Though Columbus was never to know it, his epoch-making voyage was to lead the way for the opening up of three-fourths of this planet.

All the inhabitants of the known earth of that day sparsely occupied only a quarter of the area of the globe. The voyage of the "Genoese" was to result in the discovery of areas large enough and rich enough to furnish accommodation and sustenance to all mankind then dwelling on the earth's surface! It has been estimated that even all of the people living on its bosom today could easily be provided for in the new lands, if the Old World should suffer the fate of Atlantis.

Truly, as one has said, the discovery was a revelation more divine than human.

Perhaps it was well that this stupendous fact was hidden

from him. Such glory would have been almost too much for one mortal.

Had the great Christopher known that the shores he discovered were not the coral strands of India, and that the individuals whom he carried back with him to Europe were members of a new distinctive race, he would naturally have been more elated even than he was. Could he have guessed the stupendous truth, the illustrious discoverer would probably have called the new land "Colombo" and the strange natives "Colombians."

When the startling tidings of the magnitude and uniqueness of the new land began to be "digested" in Europe, there was wonder and consternation. "America" wasn't an isolated part of Asia, but was a trans-marine *world* in itself, a sea-girt, populous Continent, distinct and separate from the rest of the earth; and, above all to the Spanish, a land of gold and jewels!

It was the most stupendous event of history. "El Mundo Nuevo"—the words were on the lips of every Spaniard and soon they were being repeated in every civilized tongue. The romance of the unknown, the allure of the exotic, gripped the minds of men everywhere. For the first time in earth's history, the "end of the rainbow" had been found and a "pot of gold" awaited the taking!

Thus was "America" brought in. No longer was she an orphan hemisphere. And from the hinterlands of space, out of the ages primeval, there had emerged another ethnological section—the *American* man. The new land was not a new eastern portion of Asia, as for one hundred and fifty years it had been supposed to be. The mainland of Asia was not "Just around the corner." A right-about-face on the part of the Spaniards was necessary before they could reach the land of their desires. Spain was much nearer to Asia than was San Salvador.

Of the magnitude of the land of his discovery Columbus was ignorant. Far be it from this author to ridicule the confused notions of geography that our illustrious Genoan

had. He was one of the greatest cosmographers of his time. Data wherefrom to arrive at correct conclusions were entirely lacking in Columbus' day.

We reserve our scorn for those who in this enlightened age still dwell in the darkness of the 16th century and ignorantly accept its decisions.

Columbus had blundered onto a Continent whose identity he never learned, "a land thickly inhabited by people and animals like Europe or Asia or Africa." The lights he had seen were kindled by people of another world—they were not the lights of Asia. The island of Guanahani was part of another hemisphere inhabited by Red Men. A new race of mankind never before known to exist was then for the first time introduced to an astonished world.

Those strange Islanders to whom the Spaniards gave hawk bells were of a different branch of humanity, up till that time unheard of by either Europe or Asia.

The voyage of the great Admiral had brought together two streams of human life which since their rise had flowed in separate channels—a sublime discovery, giving him a glory enduring as the world itself.

This is not the story of how Spain added to her dominions half a planet, amazing and breath-taking as was that epochal achievement, but of the still greater marvel that by such discovery another ethnologically-distinct race of men was found.

The real romance of America is that through the Genoese weaver-of-dreams a fourth division of "genus homo," not theretofore known even in legend was found.

Known only to God, those copper-colored people of what we now know as America dwelt in their own world, all unconscious of the fact that across the billowy oceans which shut them in there dwelt other mortals similar to themselves though unlike them in many vital respects.

We have been requested to write a "human interest" story. Was there ever a story better answering to such a

description than that of these people brought from the nowhere into the here?

As observed by Fiske "There is something solemn and impressive in the spectacle of human life thus going on for countless ages in the Eastern and Western halves of our planet, each all unknown to the other and uninfluenced by it."

So long as the lands discovered by Columbus were considered to be outer parts of Asia, the question of the inhabitants there found had presented no difficulties. They were, no doubt, *Indians* on their own mother-continent. But now that the newly-found land was seen to have no connection with Asia, another theological difficulty arose while the matter of the earth's being a sphere or being a flat surface was still in dispute. Did not the Bible teach plainly that God had created one pair of all forms of life in the Garden of Eden? How, then, had men and animals reached that far-off continent in the middle of two oceans? Moreover, said continent was literally teeming with life! As populous as any other continent! Conceivably birds and insects might have flown there, but the beasts of the field surely could not have crossed that stormy waste of waters dared only by the intrepid Columbus and his men! Stern facts confronted them, presenting problems to which there seemed no solution. Curiosity was unbounded.

How had such fullness of life reached the far-off shores of another world? The source of origin of its inhabitants was a most perplexing problem.

In the words of Prescott: "Taught by their faith to derive all created beings from one source, they felt a natural perplexity as to the manner in which these distant and insulated regions could have obtained their inhabitants. The same curiosity was felt by their countrymen at home, and the European scholars bewildered their brains with speculations on the best way of solving this interesting problem." Pope and Prelates were sorely perplexed. Here was a dilemma indeed! How had life reached that land?

In the monasteries of Spain many a learned discussion took place relative to this vital topic. It was most assuredly a staggering dilemma to the Church, a perplexing question which must be answered somehow.

The next 100 years was a period of great material gain but also of corresponding spiritual loss for the Church. That inevitably happens.

Another kind of humanity had been discovered, living on a separate and distinct continent, severed from the rest by rolling seas!

Some began to deny the teaching of Holy Writ regarding Noah and his family. Truly the Inquisition was required! Men's eternal welfare was more important than all the wealth of a material continent, however vast, and the Holy Office was kept busy.

Shocked at the very idea of there being a world of human beings out of reach of salvation, certain of the clergy wrote to the then Pope denouncing some of their brethren who considered such possible. The Pope of that day thereupon declared this to be "heresy" and censured all holding such a "dangerous doctrine."

In 1655 one Isaac de la Peyrere published a "Commentary on the pre-Adamite Hypothesis." He declared that Adam was the progenitor of the Jewish race only, and that the Deluge was only partial. His reasonable interpretation of the then existing *impasse* gained for him many secret followers, but the book was banned, and its author fell under the animadversion of the Inquisition. Sincerely or otherwise he "recanted" and retracted his "errors."

It frequently happens that the layman, free from teachers who inject their own interpretations, reads the Book painly as it is written. Medieval exegetes then as now "read into" the text of the Scriptures much that the authors never intended to convey, as we shall see in a later chapter.

If they had read Pereira's book, which, notwithstanding its being banned by the church, was the true teaching of the Scriptures, all their anxiety would have been over.

Poring over those quaintly-worded 16th century tomes, we note their questionings; but there is a strange lack of surprise that animals should have been found. When they believed that all life was not only God-created but Ark-preserved, why was their wonderment confined to *human life*? That living humans were there was what so utterly perplexed them; they do not seem to have been disturbed by the discovery of lower forms of life.

Some of the ecclesiastics leaned to the opinion that angels had superintended the distribution from the Ark on Mount Ararat to various parts of the earth. When others pointed out that only one pair of each species had been preserved, the distribution was placed at a subsequent date. That conclusion was pretty generally accepted. Heavenly hosts with wings celestial had served as "airships" to convey them thither, and highly imaginative pictures were drawn of the voyage! A magic carpet towed by angels was quite within the realm of credibility! Did they not believe that the moon and the stars were carried about by angels?

Those who may doubt the ability of mediaeval artists to portray such marvelous scenes should glance through the pages of Dante's "Inferno"! They might be short on technique, but they were long on imagination!

Even in those dark days of credulity, however, there were those who doubted—not the ability of angels to serve as celestial airships (had they not always borne the faithful dead to mansions in the skies?) but the why and wherefore of their also taking so many wild animals and noxious insects (which latter so troubled the pious explorers) was puzzling to the Nth degree.

Although Spain had no unbelievers in religion—the nation had always been strong in religious faith—nevertheless it had many dubious ones who were not able to "swallow" the "angel" theory.

The Bible story just had to be vindicated. How could God's one-pair-creation be found on a separate and isolated world? How did they reach there?

St. Clement, in his "Epistle to the Corinthians," had written of "other worlds beyond the ocean"; and St. Augustine had penned the words:—"As by God's command at the time of the creation, the earth brought forth the living creature after his kind, so a similar process must have taken place in islands too remote to be reached by animals from the continents."

These early Fathers of the Church sometimes alluded to the "far away begotten" whom they imagined to be existing in regions then unknown.

The "hinterlands" of the earth always held mystery for the ancients.

The words of Christ "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold" were frequently dwelt upon in that connection.

Those "early Fathers" and St. Augustine, however, had lived in a freer age, when men were permitted to think. *Now* the Church frowned upon independent thinking as "heterodox."

Great indeed was the relief to the clergy when in 1742 the thrice-welcome news reached Spain that one Behring, a Danish captain, though homologating Deschnew's discovery that America was a separate continent had found that in two extreme out-jutting capes, Asia came to within fifty miles of America. It would seem that Deschnew had hugged the Siberian shores and had not sighted the Alaskan coast through the dark tempestuous waters. Spain was quick to acknowledge this new discovery, and the welcome news soon spread throughout Europe. Sight was now allied to faith. They now saw a way out of the dilemma. The land of Ararat and the newly-found "America" were in juxtaposition—that was doubt's answer, opportunely demonstrated.

Across that Strait all life, humans and animals had crossed from Asia.

How much this discovery contributed to bolstering up belief in the distribution of all mankind from Ararat can scarcely be imagined now. Those were times when reli-

gious thought was paramount—although the ethics of conduct might be divorced therefrom, as was so clearly the case in the lives of the Conquistadores. There was even some thought of "canonizing" Behring. Under what circumstances he had seen the American Coast, and what difficulties were involved in the discovery were unknown, and considered of minor significance.

It is to be hoped that the Pope liberally rewarded Behring's crew for their fortunate finding of Asia so close to America so that all the birds, beasts, and creeping things, as well as man, could make their way thither from Ararat. In their zeal to uphold the supposed teaching of Holy Writ, the Red Man just had to be a Yellow Man.

If the glad tidings caused no excitement in Asia, it did affect the thought of Europe. Above all, it brought surcease from anxiety to the men of the cloister. Light shone out of the darkness. It was the salvation of the Church.

To the clergy, Asia was the sole mother-region. The solution of the problem must be one that would produce accordance with the Biblical narrative, so now what was supposed to be a natural, feasible way had been opened up. Animals and men were in the new land—therefore, they had gone there by some route, and, of course, they went from Asia! Naturally their route would be by Behring Straits! That was incontestable.

In those days of geographical ignorance, when more than half of the world was still unexplored, the idea seemed plausible and the solution was surely a welcomed one so accommodately imagined. Across that strait lay Ararat, India and China. Columbus had described them as within walking distance and had declared that he was close to Armenia, that the Orinico was one of the rivers that girdled Eden. This was the land of Ophir, the place so long speculated on from which Solomon had secured his gold.

The unthinking imagined that a natural entrance had been discovered and that the whole perplexing problem had been solved. Populous Asia could easily have given emi-

grants to a contiguous land. The journey seemed feasible. It was only a distance of fifty miles.

So, by the sanction of his own will, the Pope in a Pronouncement decreed that the American natives, after scattering from the Ark, had made their way into America by way of Siberia.

As the lawyers would say, it was *res judicata* (a thing judged). The infallible Pontiff had decided the question.

The decision was both convenient and seductive. It ended 250 years of "faith without sight."

That "America" was peopled from Siberia then became a religious dogma, to be accepted along with Holy Writ. The pronunciamento of the Pope, arbiter of all matters scientific as well as religious, had settled the question—just as definitely as though the route taken had been all marked with arrows and numbers! Now the Bible had been vindicated in their minds, no other conclusion was possible or allowable.

It was un-Christian to hold any other view! It was all as surely settled as though the Scriptures had stated the fact in so many words! None dreamed of trying to question it. It was a closed chapter.

Dissent therefrom was out of the question. The Inquisition was functioning! It was decreed and that ended the matter.

Those were days when theological questions were more vital than life—and not infrequently involved a choice between life and death!

Thus was the whole question settled by the ecclesiastically-minded, and many a sigh of relief came from the hearts of the devout.

The reader will observe that the clergy did not *arrive* at this conclusion—they started from it.

This was the only theory which would fit properly into that age of blind faith. It was a desired invention of anxious minds.

All was interpreted according to their preconceived ideas

and cherished wishes. Their minds being already conditioned by this pronunciamiento, an end was virtually put to all discussion of the subject, and it has retarded the progress of thought along these lines, even up to the present day. Most men have, unthinkingly, acquiesced in the decision. Common acceptance and accepted usage have given it authority almost beyond question. It had the blessing of the Church. But for its semi-religious origin the thought would have died out generations ago had it not been made a part of their religion.

It was an ecclesiastical solution, and such is all that the theory ever had! This is a plain statement of fact.

Bringing the Amerind from Asia was the most *colossal instance of baseless assumption known to history!* Nothing indicative of its rightness has ever been found.

There is not now and never was any evidence to substantiate such a wild hypothesis as the one in question. Thoughtful men are now rejecting such an absurd conjecture. A later age and subsequent discoveries show an Asiatic pilgrimage to be uncalled for, and only invented to satisfy the religious tenets of a dark age. It is no better-founded than the discarded "angel" theory. The belief came in only as a corollary from the Mosaic cosmogony, and was thus acquiesced in from a supposed necessity—which no longer exists. It is not supported by the facts of human experience. It was a piously-invented fable! To quote the words of Conrad: "It was the product of the mediæval mind playing in its ponderous, childish way with the problems of our earth's shape, its character, and its inhabitants."

In the light of 400 years of discoveries made since the gallant Columbus sailed westward, it is time that we graduated! Since the discovery of "America" we have discarded the "flat earth" hypothesis. No longer has the Inquisition power to mold our thoughts. We now know and dare to affirm that the earth moves. Why then should we cling to the Middle Ages notion as to the Indians' descent and

birthland? It is puerile to do so as these are no longer tenable. There is nothing to go upon.

However, since that distant day when Spain once and for all time "settled" (?) the question by "deciding" (?) that the American Indian was an Asian emigrant, tradition, custom, and indolence of mind have perpetuated this ready-made-hand-me-down decision.

Has it in the last quadriennium been found that the alignment of the Red Man and the Asian was sound—though the reason therefor might be considered puerile? By no means! Not one branch of Science has ever set its seal to it! The first source of the edict is still the sole origin; but traditions are apt to maintain their weight long after their authors are dust.

The "conclusion" has survived the destruction of the "premise" upon which it was based! It was a conclusion far in advance of the evidence; but oh how persistent has been its continuance! It is now embalmed in religious concrete!

Hundreds of years of discoveries and sane reasoning have failed to dislodge the early claim! Lo! the poor Indian was given over to Asia through a fondly (and incurably) cherished pious idea!

Priestly pronouncements no longer are deemed the oracles of God. Today we think for ourselves. No longer do hackneyed phrases satisfy the thoughtful. However, it must be admitted that the thoughts of the great majority of people are similar to those of the generations preceding them. Once a foolish phrase is uttered by someone, it is surprising how many sensible people will go on repeating it, without rhyme or reason! Apparently—"If it's trite, it's right!"

It is a sad commentary upon our vaunted culture that some 20th century individuals are not even yet wholly freed from the so-called "decisions" of feudal times; but mighty indeed is the power of a religious tenet!

History bears witness to the fact that it takes many cen-

turies to rid men of religious notions that have become bone and flesh of their flesh. Baldwin writes: "It is remarkable, however, to note that since the hagiologists of the Middle Ages settled the question, to their minds, by bringing the Indian from Asia, the thoughtless have followed that fashion of thinking, all unaware of the amusing absurdity of it. Is Walter Lippman right when in his *Preface To Morals* he asserts "Ninety per cent of men are sheep?"

We have dwelt on this Pronouncement of the Pope at some length because it was the first, has been the only, and to many today is the final word concerning the Indians' ancestry.

Many individual ethnologists have accepted it automatically just as though it were a matter of history, many others have, by their silence given consent, but observe that no body of scientists in any land has ever subscribed to it.

We can and must excuse the general acceptance of this edict by the early writers. In a new land, everything was supposed to be new. The decision was simply premature. It was at least conceivable that the few scattered people then supposed to be inhabiting the new land were emigrants thither from somewhere—like those who began to flock there, but it is one of the puzzling things of the 20th century that millions who no longer accept the Pope's word as being *Vox Dei*, or the geography of the 17th century as being accurate, still glibly assert that America was peopled from the Orient as though it were one of the immortal verities.

This author recently met an instructor in one of our universities who very strongly believed the Indians came in by way of Siberia. He could not give any logical reason for his belief—in fact he could not think of *any* reason! It is known, however, that behind him there are long centuries of strict religious teaching which had become part of the man's life—though he did not realize this and doubtless would not have believed it. The utter ingenuousness of some would-be "thinkers" is pathetic.

The positivism of those who merely accept heart-beliefs is much more positive than is the head-belief of those who have a reason for the hope that is in them. We believe what we learned by our *hearts* to believe! Heart-knowledge clings tenaciously and is ever stronger than proof. Religious *opinions* are always more tenaciously held to than are facts, for the emotional nature of man is ever stronger than the nature of reason. Millions of people do not know by whom, and for what reason they were commanded so to believe. They imagine it to be according to their own reasoning.

The imitative may sing this refrain, but the understanding few do not—they smile instead!

The emigration-from-Siberia hypothesis isn't even a reasonable one today after our four hundred years of evolutionary history. As Bancroft remarks, the theory "hasn't a leg to stand on." There has never been one scintilla of evidence produced in its favor. The question has been "proved" for four hundred years simply by not having been "disproved!" The pathetic fallacy is as out of date as the *ruche* worn by Columbus.

The from-Asia hypothesis is defended only because it is a cherished religious belief. Someone has written "The error is too old, if not too respectable, to be corrected. It is sanctified by old age."

Why should we lump the Amerind with the Yellow race because of a supposed and no longer cogent religious necessity when such a classification does violence to reason?

The pages of the much-misunderstood book of Genesis have been quoted vehemently against the arrival of any other conclusion. Upon that "decision," writers and speakers have builded, and unfortunately, only a few have paused to consider for themselves whether the 16th century conclusion was warranted, or whether there was or is any evidence whatsoever to prove it to have been a sound one.

The author has travelled in every Continent. He knows the Indians from Alaska to Patagonia and can corroborate

the words of Catlin who visited 120 Indian tribes and wrote "In the whole extent of the whole American Continent, from Behring Straits to Tierra del Fuego, there is not to be seen a Mongol, a Kalmuk, or a Siberian Tartar, nor a word of their language to be heard.

In this 20th century when old theories and hypotheses are being debunked on every hand, and we are looking into the source of ancient superstitions, scientists have commenced to question this one, and have sought to break away from the shackles of the old tradition; but the label "Of Oriental Origin" has been affixed to the Amerinds for so long that it is found almost impossible to pry it off! Like the mud into which the diplodocus sank—which afterwards turned into stone and became part and parcel of the beast—it requires much chipping to dislodge it! Opinions become fixed when men stop thinking.

As Dr. Hardlicka truly avers: "No physical proof has yet been found that the American Indian migrated from Asia by way of Siberia."

Now let us see why America could not possibly have been peopled from Siberia.

Spirit of the frozen north,
Where the wave is chained and still.
And the savage bear looks forth
Nightly from his caverned hill!
Down from Thy eternal throne,
From the land of cloud and storm
Where the meeting ice-bergs groan
Sweeping on thy wrathful form.
Spirit of the frozen wing!
Dwellers of a voiceless clime,
Where no coming on of spring
Gilds the weary course of time!
Monarch of a realm untrod
By the restless feet of men
Where alone the hand of God
'Mid His mighty works hath been!

—Whittier.

CHAPTER IV

THE DISCOVERY OF AMERICA FROM ASIA

"Long have I waited lonely, shunned as a thing accursed,
Monstrous, moody, pathetic, the last of the lands and the first."

To further bolster up the ultimatum of the church, the idea was then "hatched" of a "land bridge" which at one time must have connected the two continents.

The land-neck theory has been a talking point ever since those early days. But this imaginary connecting bridge, first conjured up in the 17th century is still imaginary. There is no geological evidence that such a natural bridge once existed! Not a trace of such land has ever been found! On the contrary, all the findings of geological research are *against* the theory.

How utterly foolish are those pictures we sometimes see of Mongolians wending their way across this one way traffic bridge into America. One illustration we have seen shows an elephant trudging over with an ape perched on its back. Are we then to infer that there was a green light on the Asiatic side, and a red one on the American side forbidding entry? The truth is that no human life existed in those latitudes until very recently and the only light which ever shone was the mystic aurora borealis. Strange that the thoughtless cannot see how lopsided their idea is.

If land did at one time span the two continents and join the two worlds, what of it? It is quite an immaterial question. It did not unite the peoples of the two continents, for there were no inhabitants within a thousand miles of the "bridge" to avail themselves of it. No human beings dwelt in the polar wastes on either side, moreover Americans and Mongols were absolutely ignorant of the exist-

ence of one another or that their lands came close together.

Oriental people and American aborigines then were and still are farther apart than are the Amerinds from Europeans!

If Behring Straits forms a natural access into America from Asia, why isn't it used today?

In the marvellous pageant of moving races given us by H. G. Wells in his "Outline of History," he allocates no people to Siberia; tells that "no paleolithic remains of men are found there or in Sweden and Norway, nor in any of the cold lands," and he does not even show Siberia on any of his maps when referring to the distribution of early man. Nevertheless, somehow even Mr. Wells in the old hackneyed expressions brings Mongoloids across this *bridge* into America. We would wish that in such an otherwise truly great work he had been more accurate in this connection. It is disappointing to read that all of northern Asia, and even Sweden and Norway, were ice-bound at that time, and yet Wells brings human beings over a waste land which he does not even indicate in any map, at some unknown time, in some unknown way, and from some unspecified place! Is this not an inconsistency on his part? Then on the very next page of his "Outline" he tells the reader that Behring Straits on coming into existence isolated the Amerinds.

While on the subject of this mythical bridge, scientists tell us that the camel and the horse originated in America. One imaginative author writes: "When the glaciers of the great Ice Age four hundred thousand years ago separated the two great continental regions, the last camels were left in the Old World and the llamas in the New." We are therefore supposed to assume that all the specimens of horses and camels then existing in a world whose extent was seventeen million square miles just chanced to be at that particular time on the Asiatic side of the disturbance and thus could not reach home again! Also that not a single pair of llamas happened to be on the Asiatic side! A far-

fetches theory! So much is written without thought! Such fantasies are not worthy of comment. Human reason would rather lean to the conclusion that American evolution got no further in camel-making than the llama and the ehippus horse. Moreover in the Old World there are fossils of dwarf camels and horses, while no sign of the lama is found there. America never brought forth a real camel or a real horse. Llama bones have been found nowhere but in America. Why are no Asian animals found in this hemisphere?

How can we believe that human beings left their homeland and crossed over two thousand miles of Siberia to reach this entry bridge, when the native animals, already there in the proximity of the causeway did not cross? If such a neck of land joined the two continents, the wild life, accustomed to such sub zero zones, such as the yak, the snow leopard, and the panda would have found it easy to roam over. They are by nature homeless wanderers. Why were none of them found here? Also why, of all the millions of American bison did none cross to Asia? How are we to swallow the theory that human beings, not already in Siberia, made the journey, while beasts in close proximity did not? Why is this striking fact ignored? American plants and animals were found specifically distinct from those of Europe, Asia, Africa and Oceania, suggesting complete and utter isolation. Not only were they here, but it was proved that they had been here for thousands of generations, in a mystic continent of their own, entirely separate from the rest of the earth.

There never has been a grain of proof to show that the old ecclesiastical solution was the correct one. The "decision" rendered was one of faith, not ratiocination; but no roots go so deep as do those of superstition.

In the ensuing 400 years naught has been discovered to substantiate the view, but the "Yellow ticket" still sticks!

There is not a shred of *proof* that America was peopled from Siberia.

The hypothesis was groundless! The "decision" was one based on ignorance, as the theologians of that day were wholly without the sort of knowledge which would carry weight in such a matter. Their "decision" was based solely upon a *pseudo* premise.

Thus was the whole ethnological race of Red Men pronounced Yellow Men in order to satisfy a supposed religious necessity that they should be such! The Indian was told that his grandparents were Orientals. All men were commanded to believe it, and have so believed it ever since!

But things are not always what they *seem* to be!

Medieval theologians discovered only what they invented, and their invention had all the weakness of the science of the Middle Ages—an era when Dante's "Inferno" could be written and preached as giving a true picture of the invisible world. (This way of their dilemma was as absurd as the "angel" theory, had they but known it.)

"Necessity is the mother of invention," we are told. Here, then, we have the *raison d'être* of the legend!

Walter Duranty says: "The trouble with most people is that they think with their hopes or fears or wishes rather than with their minds."

In this "family history" we see the inception of the "had-to-be-brought-in" idea. The need became the mother of the invented assurance.

It is quite excusable not to be able to *think ahead*, but there is no excuse whatever for not being able to *think back* and form conclusions in the clearer light of history than men then had. As we view the question today, we see that such a decision was unnecessary and erroneous. It is contrary to the logic of history.

So the glibly-uttered "phrase" of today to the effect that the Amerind came through Siberia was in the first instance a pontifical dictum, invented to uphold the simple narrative that all humanity had descended from Adam and Eve in a Garden in Asia Minor. Thus we see why and how it originated. The weighty authority of the then Pope set the

ball arolling and has kept it going for four hundred years.

Thus millions and millions of people—plainly seen now to be a new race—living on a new world, just emerged from the mists in which it had been enveloped since the dawn of creation, were for theological reasons given a wholly mistaken origin! All mankind then accepted it with complacency—swallowed it whole without reflection. For years nobody dared (and thereafter nobody cared) to take the trouble to prove or disprove it. The Amerind was “earmarked” and his status fixed till the crack of doom!

Surely we of the 20th century ought not to be bound hand and foot by the teachings of the hagiologists of the Middle Ages, who solved every problem, scientific or otherwise, by more or less perverted religious standards.

This tradition—current for four hundred years—still binds and blinds the unthinking. The minds of those who regard the “Amerind” as being Asian are still in the 16th century, though their feet pace 20th century pavements!

The truth may seem harsh, but it must be admitted that men today base their belief in the Asiatic origin of the Amerind solely on the ideas of cartographers who placed Palestine in Venezuela and thought that the river Orinoco of South America was the Tigris of Asia Minor.

Prelates who solemnly discussed among themselves as to how many hosts of angels could find standing room on the point of a needle were not qualified to decide such a momentous question.

When Eastern America was discovered, the world was entirely unaware of any territory to the west, likewise, Asia had been ignorant of the existence of any other land to the east, and it was news to them to learn that their Continent extended a thousand miles farther north and farther east than their imagination had pictured. It remained for western people to be the first to sight the new Continent, and to tell Asia that she had a neighbor to the north! However, the news was unproductive of results for their “East Cape” (as it was called later) was at least two thousand

miles from China or from Korea, through an uninhabited and unknown wilderness. The supposed "route" was not used because there was none and is none. Oriental people come to America now by the only sane way, namely, a two-weeks journey from ports farther south where they live.

The coming of Mongols to America is as imaginary as is the bridge by which they are alleged to have crossed, and is regarded by many today with deep suspicion.

In this connection, read the words of Friar Odoric, a missionary returned from the East:—"I heard tell that there be trees which bear men and women like fruit upon them . . . (there people) are fixed in the tree up to the navel, and there they be; when the wind blows, they be fresh, but when it does not blow, they be all dried up!"

Remember, intelligent reader, that it was men like Friar Odoric who "decided" that the Amerind came from Asia—which "decision" millions of people have since then accepted, solely upon the "authority" of their word! There is no later authority for such belief, which should be as alien to our modern thinking as the "angel airship" hypothesis! A feeble age is the mother of feeble concepts of truth.

Believing as did the 16th century Church that all living creatures had come out of the Ark, one wonders how they could conjure up those extramundane and all but preternatural creatures, for all life is life.

Though bizarre and strangely colored, the aborigines of America were *real men and women*, creatures of intelligence, and the Spaniards employed the men as guides and pilots. Hence they were Eden-created—consequently from Asia.

Truly those early dreamers, who so complacently and religiously fixed the route of the Yellow Man's migration—while sitting in their monasteries—never imagined what distances and what obstacles were involved therein. How could they conceive of 2,000 miles of icy steppes or a frozen ocean separating the people of the Orient from America? The geographical proximity and supposed propinquity of

peoples were all imaginative, as a glance at "Mercator's Projection" will show.

The idea was a simple one, but its implications were not dreamed of.

Those 16th century arbiters of thought who decreed that the Red Man came here from Siberia were, of course, not in possession of our later knowledge. Men dead for 400 years have no right to lay their clammy hands on men of the 20th century and tell us what to believe.

There are some ideas, which at the time of their formulation at least seemed reasonable, but in the fresh light of today, the supposition that America was peopled from Siberia borders on the ridiculous!

Time has so proved it; four hundred years of time.

The childlike fancies of untaught minds, which can people a Continent with angel-borne emigrants, or bring its inhabitants in some manner from where they are not, and never have been, to where they already are, have been outgrown, like our belief in ghosts and mermaids.

The question was "solved" too superficially. But that was the best they could do who did not know what they were doing. You can't get blood out of a turnip.

Could anything be more illogical than this attempt to make an older race an offshoot of a younger?

To put the saddle on a little horse sense would be so easy today.

Repetition of an item of belief does not vouch for its "so-ness." Let us think things out.

It does not require the thinking of an Einstein to see that Asians could not migrate to America from where there were none to migrate.

How could the clergy guess that it would prove to be another case of "so near and yet so far?" "Logic" was absent from their theo-"logic"al discussions, for thus far they were as ignorant of the existence of the "buffer" land now called "Siberia" separating India and China from America as they had been of America itself. "Hind-sight"

is said to be better than "fore-sight!" When still later it was learned that Siberia was an untrodden, frozen wilderness, destitute of human life, and as unknown to the people of Asia as America had been to them and to Europe, the route was seen to be no route at all! By no stretch of imagination could the estimated fifty millions of Red Men found to be inhabiting "America" be the overflow from an empty land! There could be no spilling over—for the tail doesn't wag the dog! That fog-bound Arctic land did not "link" two Continents—it *divided* two worlds even more effectively than the Atlantic which had been the barrier separating America from Europe. The "propinquity" of peoples imagined by European scholars simply did not exist. It was wholly hypothetic. Notwithstanding the fact that the "Sea of Darkness" separated Europe from America, in reality Europeans were in closer touch with Amerinds—as had been proved by Columbus' epoch-making discovery. Daring as had been the passage across the Atlantic, that Ocean was navigable; while even to this day the (supposed) Siberian "route" remains unopened. Just as the west had its "Sea of Darkness," so the East had its "Land of Darkness." The Atlantic had been the nightmare of seafaring men since its creation; but the far-eastern primeval area of mist was just as untraversed and forbidding.

The "Far East" was enveloped in the Cimmerian darkness of primeval creation, the supposed land of dragons, years after America had become an open book. While the ruins of its ancient cities indicated that America had been inhabited continuously for many ages, Siberia, on the contrary, was found to be a "*terra incognita*" to which man had not as yet penetrated. We could imagine a land shorn of its inhabitants; but geological research shows Siberia to have been as virgin territory as the volcanic island cast up from the ocean-bed today, as yet untrodden by human foot. Every area of American soil, on the other hand, reveals man's foot-prints. The far eastern hinterlands of Asia had always been a world of shadows and a land of

fabled horrors and spectres—represented now by Church “gargoyles.” Marco Polo had heard much about it but had not ventured in.

Sir John Moundeville in recounting his pilgrimage to the East of India in the year 1322 writes: “And beyond the land and isles and deserts in going toward the east, men find nothing but mountains and great rocks, and there is the dark region where no man may see, either by day or night.” Those desolate regions did not belong to the habitable world. The newly-acquired territory thus meant little to Asia. To such barren lands there was no allure. A western power first traversed it and later took possession and gave it the name of “Siberia,” for like America it was unnamed. At that time the Far Northeast was as untenanted as is the North or the South Pole today, for the ever-increasing population of Asia had not then begun to occupy half of the territory they require today. It was left for later, crowded times to drive the Mongols and the Kal-mucs northward—just as the settling of North America drove the Indians ever westward.

Asia was not then crowded. The old world conquered by Alexander the Great was perhaps no more populous than the new world was found to be. There waited still to be discovered three-fourths of the world! The northern section—the imagined route and gateway of the first Pilgrims—is still unexplored.

We can well understand, though it is hard for us to visualize, that in early ages the world's population consisted of thousands, and even farther back of hundreds only.

Now that we know more of Siberia, are there any evidences of pre-historic human occupation found on the fancied route by which the Amerind is assumed to have travelled? Has the supposed emigrant left any traces of his journey through the extreme east of Asia to the American mainland? While our own wide Continent is strewn with ruins and graves, thus proving lengthy human occupation, Siberia is destitute of any sign that ancient man

ever entered its inhospitable wastes. It is obvious that there could be no "overflowing" from a land uninhabited!

It is an insult to present-day explorers for people to think of primitive man as wandering into regions as yet untrodden by us with all of our civilized resources, and requirements in the way of new territory. Few know better than do we who have travelled therein of the immense tracts of land still unexplored to this day in South America alone!

Moreover, if the warm sunlit seas were only beginning to be traversed in early ages, it is certain that mariners at the beginning had never ventured into the tempestuous waters of the Arctic.

It is making an under-statement to say that Columbus and his men, and Behring and his heroes were "red plush" pioneers as compared with what any such early Tartar band would have been!

To imagine that some "Noah-Columbus" voyaged to America, bringing with him men and women is preposterous! Why would not such a leader also bring horses and cattle to aid the settlers settle?

Let us consider the way by which those mythical "colonists" would have had to come. Their journey would lie through the empty, gelid, unexplored world of Tartary and Siberia to Behring Straits—a distance of thousands of miles—then through the Arctic waters referred to, and from the Behring Sea to South America, where the largest population was found, a distance of ten thousand miles or more.

The diary of such an itinerary is surely lost, and Baron Munchausen didn't supply us with another!

To trace the imagined route of this prehistoric emigrant is to show the absurdity of it. What incentive for it was there thousands of years ago? Why should man journey from warm sunny lands to icy waters, and through wind-swept seas to another equally frozen coast—ignorant of the fact that further south there were more congenial zones? Bear in mind that he had no kind Irish friend settled there! No one wrote him glowing accounts about the streets being paved with gold or its being a land flowing with milk and

honey—much less sent him money orders wherewith to defray the expense of such a journey!

The assumption of there being such a migration of early man to a country unknown is not, we say, tenable. In any hypothesis we should at least be reasonable. The idea is ludicrous.

If a band of Orientals did make the pilgrimage from Siberia to America today, the exploit would rank as one of the greatest in history.

We have never heard of any Asiatic trying to enter America by that route; and if the first American settlers came by way of Siberia, when and why was the emigration suspended? With advancing knowledge, there ought to have been increased migration. As the population enlarged in Asia, the new outlet would have been more and more used. Why should the new land and the new route to it have been lost sight of and so far forgotten that Europeans had to come from the other side of the world and show it to Asia?

The truth of the matter is that America was as unknown to Asia as it was to Europe and emigration therefrom much more improbable than from Europe.

In all the lore of the east, garnered from the profundity of all the knowledge of the ages, there is not a single line to show that such a fearful and wonderful journey was ever attempted, or that they ever dreamed of another Continent as an outlet. Until recently, they needed none. All Old-World people occupied only one-fourth of the globe. This author has travelled in northern Europe and tramped through the muskeg and tundra, and has sailed the northern seas of Europe and the Pacific, and in his opinion a voyage from Europe to America by way of Iceland and Greenland would be just a holiday tour by comparison with a journey from Peking across three thousand miles of Arctic wilderness to East Cape in Siberia and then across the sea to Alaska. Those who, once for all told the world that the Amerind came from the Orient could not know that

from Madrid to Armenia was but a jaunt through civilized countries, whereas from Behring Straits to Armenia was much more than twice the distance—through unknown lands, and over barren, pathless “steppes” with no inhabitants? A region covered with mist like a blanket, and winter almost the year around.

Let Dr. Spinden speak:

“There is no good reason for supposing that men lived in northern Asia in the late Pleistocene. The ice had not yet retreated and the road to America was blocked. None of the old sites of primitive man in Asia reached very far north. And before any ice-free road to America can be sustained, it must be shown that habitations were erected. The road north and east was very long.”

Writing of early man, H. G. Wells says: “Over most of the great wilderness of earth you could have sought him in vain: only in a few temperate and subtropical river valleys would you have found the squatting lares of his little herds, a male, a few females, a child or so.”

H. G. Wells, in his maps very wisely left Arctic lands blank. All maps show northern territory as unpeopled. We must bear in mind the fact that the ancient world had not as many millions as we have billions! Within the lifetime of some who read these pages, the population of the world has *doubled itself*! Prehistoric man was no such great traveler.

Primitive men had no need to occupy the ends of the earth. Moreover, if they preferred bleak, wintry lands, why do we find millions of them clustered together in tropical Mexico after reaching here?

Consider the anomaly of trying to bring the Red Man, with all his accumulated centuries of civilization, from a virgin land into which man had never entered from the beginning of the world until historic times!

Comparatively speaking, the Siberian of today is yesterday's immigrant for the whole northern area of Siberia was virgin land until Russian occupation times.

Until comparatively recent times Siberia continued to remain uninhabited. It has been left for 20th century airships to map out its desolate wastes—which even to this good day do not have as much as one inhabitant to four square miles. Even civilized Canada did not know of the Klondyke region, the Mackenzie Basin, and other large areas until the 19th century! Now “Little America,” another frigid land, is claiming our attention. If treasure is ever found there, men will rush southward just as they stampeded northward to the Klondyke. Yes we were one.

When Dr. Spinden tells us that the Amerind is not of Mongolian origin, but Siberian, he overlooks the fact that he had already written that primitive man did not populate Siberia, therefore there were no Siberians. To speak of Siberian people of pre-Columbian times would be no more intelligent than to talk of the inhabitants of Little America today. Noting the varied claims to that land, it will be populated in coming years just as Siberia has been, then, we may speak of Antarcticans or South Poleites.

The population of Siberia today is made up of exiled Russians, trappers, and drifters of all nations, Eastern and Western.

If the Amerind is Siberian, then he came to America only long after Columbus discovered him already here, which is surely a paradox. Could anything be more illogical than this attempt to make an older race the offshoot of a younger. The children do not precede the parents.

So the marginal thinking of the 17th century Clergy had brought people from a region unoccupied since the beginning of time, through an imaginary gateway of whose existence no Oriental had ever heard, for it is extremely improbable that any wandering Asian had ever been within a thousand miles of the straits! There was a no-mans land between the two worlds. Thousand of miles of unnamed steppes separated them from Alaska, while the two greatest oceans effectually separated the Amerinds from all others of human kind. In reality, physically they were

nearer to Europeans than to Asians, but mentally equally distant from both.

This author has known a temperature of 70° below zero in those inclement lands! Naught but the lust for gold or the quenchless love of adventure could draw men into those Arctic wilds; but the waters were teeming with wild sea-life of species previously unknown to the world, and thus adventurers from the distant parts of the earth braved the elements in order to secure furs, etc.—which of course meant riches on returning home. Sea-cows, foxes, otters and seals were to be seen by the *million!* Think of there being sea-cows (now extinct) 35 feet long! “An enormous mammal, more than three tons in weight, with hind-quarters like a whale, snout and fore-fins resembling a cow, grazing in herds on the fields of sea-kelp, gazing languidly without fear on the new comer—man! True fish in its hind-quarters, but ox-like in its head and its habits—snorting like a horse as it grazed, with the hind-leg a fin, the fore-fin a leg, udder between the forelegs, and in place of teeth, plates!” Laut in *Vikings of the Pacific*.”

If the human inhabitants of the New World had been as grotesque as were these animals, the monks of the old world would not have been surprised! All the old books and maps show that it was generally believed in those days that the Farthest East, Africa's farthest South, and all other unknown lands and seas were inhabited by hydras and gorgons—like those the author has so frequently seen, cut in stone to adorn (?) European cathedrals.

Until recent years, Orientals were by no means land-poor. Primitive men had no need to occupy the ends of the earth. Moreover, if they preferred bleak, wintry lands, why do we find millions of them clustered together in tropical Mexico after reaching here?

Because of the prestige of the centuries, minds have been strangely but completely closed to research along this line, and the cultivated obsession has even taken possession of

scientists. Why think when the matter was settled so long ago. Let bygones be bygones.

It is a noteworthy fact that while America was brought to the notice of the Old World in 1492 and found to be inhabited, Eastern Siberia was not explored until many years later and was found to be an unpeopled waste—an unknown to the dwellers of Asia as was our West to John Alden.

The eastern shores of America were discovered in a few weeks; but it took centuries of arduous exploration to determine the fact that the continent was in no sense physically connected with Asia, and still longer for us to see the absurdity of the conclusion that its people had migrated from the Orient. Siberia was as unknown to the dwellers in Asia as was our West to John Alden, and settlers began to percolate into both lands at about the same time.

Until west found east it had remained more unknown than the stars which could be seen, and more mysterious, because not even imagined. Man cannot fly in the face of nature.

Let us turn aside for a moment and see how Russia found and traversed over even southern Siberia.

While Spain was pursuing her conquests in America and reaping golden harvests therefrom, Russia under the intrepid Czar Peter the Great began to extend her borders eastward. Deschnew had shown them that Northeast Asia extended indefinitely in that direction; and that till then unknown, unoccupied and nameless land was thenceforth to be called "Siberia." This virgin territory—the bleakest of all the lands of the globe—was annexed unseen. There was no one to oppose them.

Read the marvelous story of how Russia began to extend her boundaries ever northward and eastward into unoccupied lands. As her population grew, so did her territory. Have we not a concrete example of that in our own country's growth in numbers and extent? There was this difference; however, that we had wandering tribes of Indians

to subdue while they found bleak wintry steppes which the foot of man had never pressed.

Peter the Great found that going northward was to a great extent impractical and unprofitable, so he forged eastward. Learning that there were warmer islands on the New American coast, he determined to annex them.

The Russian expedition under Behring had orders to journey towards the Southeast coast (now called "Kamchatka") a thousand miles southwest of the cape which Deschnew had seen, and approximately one thousand miles from the Alaskan coast. Thus early was it known and realized that the northerly route to East Cape was impracticable. Behring was instructed to fell trees and build two ships on that coast, and to cross the sea and annex for Russia any unoccupied lands and islands which might be found. Thus arose another nation bent on world-empire.

Just as Columbus had sailed westward, Behring now started eastward.

More than a thousand horses, two thousand leathern sacks of flour, and other provisions by the ton, had been gathered together, and the expedition started from St. Petersburg. Behring spent eight years crossing those six thousand miles of mountains, rivers and deserts. Many of the men (and horses) were torn to pieces by the timber-wolves, but the survivors persevered.

Through sinking tundras, over white-domed mountains higher than our American "Rockies," through unexplored and unknown forests, to the Coast of Kamchatka was a saga of horrors. A third of Behring's men perished before they saw the Ocean—and that was 1,000 miles south to Cape East, to reach which they knew was impossible.

Watch the little ships, the "St. Peter" and the "St. Paul"—built on the Kamchatkan Coast, as they battle the icy seas. These vessels, caulked with the tallow of sea-cows, and whose ropes were made from the hides of sea-animals, were driven hither and thither, through snows and fogs lit up by almost unearthly lights from the Alaskan volcanoes

to be later discovered. The crews suffered from scurvy and other sicknesses, and some of the men died. Well might Laut, the historian, describe it as being "the greatest naval expedition known to the world. Beside it other expeditions to America pale into insignificance."

Thus were spent eleven years! Eight on the land and three on the relentless sea which rages almost constantly in those latitudes. Behring perished along with thirty-one members of his crew in the final accomplishing of his task. The first Russians to land in America were all massacred. Thirty thousand folios relating to that expedition were preserved in St. Petersburg for many years. Columbus discovered America in a few short weeks; but it took Behring as many years to find the northwest portion of it!

Those who then sat in their monasteries in Spain (as well as those who sit in arm-chairs in their studies now) must not tell us in this age of intelligence that Orientals colonized America by the route referred to!

These are absurd theories, whereat we laugh; but to stand beside the grave of Behring on the storm-wracked island where he perished is to weep.

Never, never could any sane man believe that Mongoloids made this journey 25 or 50 thousand years ago and crossed to America! It is less reasonable than the angel-towed-carpet theory!

Does the reader realize that from Kamchatka to the nearest American land is over 3,000 miles?

Directly in the path of Behring, there is a chain of lands known as the Aleutian Islands. Some of these islands were visited and taken possession of by Russia. The people found there called themselves "Aleuts," and as the voyage was continued more and more of these Aleuts were seen, especially towards the American coast. There were none on the Eastern coast which they had left.

Behring by his red-blooded courage succeeded in finding the mainland of America—or rather those islands guard-

ing it, now known as "Alaska," and annexed all for his master, the Russian Czar.

One asks "Might not colonists have left Kamchatka as Behring did?" Ridpath's History contains the following: "That the Kamchatkans coming by way of the frozen northwest became the progenitors of the Red Men has not evidence other than conjecture to support it." We might also assert that there were no Kamchatkans until late historical times.

In all human probability that expedition of Behring was the first attempt made in the history of the world to establish connection between the two Continents, and their eyes the first to behold Alaskan shores, and they were Europeans.

Eastern Asia was first discovered by Eskimos from northern Europe, was next seen by Behring, and finally by men from North America.

Writing of the Aleutian Islands, Ellsworth Huntington in the *Yale Press* raises the question: "Was there once a bridge of land from Asia to America in this region?" He then replies to his own query thus: "There is no evidence of such a link between the two Continents, for a few raised beaches indicate that during geological times the Aleutian Islands have been uplifted rather than depressed."

A paragraph in Buffton's *Cyclopedia* reads as follows: "The hypothesis of an immigration from Asia by way of the Aleutian Islands to Alaska might be acceptable did not the certainty of the presence of an indigenous American population in the Quaternary Age reduce it to the proportions of a secondary act. Any grafting of the old-world people was on a true American stock." In other words, America was peopled *before* the lands wherefrom they are supposed to have come were populated!

Eastern people did not discover America. Europeans found both east and west coasts.

As this is being penned, the newsboy comes along with a daily paper, and we see therein an article captioned "FIND NEW TRACES OF MOVEMENTS ASIA TO

ALASKA" and stating that explorers are working on St. Lawrence Island in the Behring Sea in an endeavor to find traces of early emigrants from Asia to Alaska. It appears they have found human remains "ante-dating the discovery of the island by Behring in 1728."

After months of endeavor, the expedition returned home with evidence of the truth of the theory. They had found a clue! They were elated! The long-believed idea was correct! In a cave on one of the islands they had found the mummy of an old man. True, the mummy was wrapped up and interred in the method common to the Aleutian Islanders, and the corpse bore a resemblance to the rest of the tribes now inhabiting those isles; but when he was reverently undraped, around his neck there was found a string of *Korean* amber beads! That necklace was sufficient for them! It was all the confirmation they required! It indicated (they believed) that its wearer was an Asian; therefore he must have been one of the original pilgrims to America! The "Columbus" of antiquity! Possibly the "Moses" who had led his people thus far, but was not himself permitted to enter the "Promised Land"! The discovery was evidence to them that all pre-Columbian folk had come to America by that route!

The fact that Korea is farther from that island than New York is distant from Europe apparently was not considered!

The further fact that wreckage of all kinds is constantly swirling in the currents around those stormy islands, bring flotsam and jetsam from Asia and Alaska, meant nothing to them! The beads were *Korean*—hence the man must have been a pre-Mayflower pilgrim who had got cold feet.

To find men examining human bones to ascertain if they are those of a band of America-bound emigrants from Asia is pathetic. To imagine that the relics must of a certainty be such is to evince ignorance. These could not *possibly* be bones of Amerinds who had ventured out into the Pacific! Just another illustration of the old "one-way thor-

oughfare" idea! We wonder if there is another Commission at work to find the burial place of the "seven dwarfs." One quest would be as intelligent as the other.

Considering the cost of the voyage, the toil involved, and the child-like assurance of success of the "discoverers," it must be truly disheartening for them to find that no authority gives the mummy in question an antiquity greater than 500 years! If the reader can discover anything that amounts to *proof* in this discovery, he will have made a "discovery" indeed. Personally we were quite unable to do so. The argument is as flimsy as the string of beads, which broke in the handling! Our stenographer likewise wears a string of Korean amber beads—but she *isn't Korean!* So we again see nothing but a comedy of errors.

On such chimerical reasoning as the above has been builded the whole hypothesis of ex-Asia migration!

The key which those voyagers imagined would fit the lock unfortunately refuses to work. The door remains stubbornly closed!

When so much badly-needed research work is held up for lack of funds, it is sad to think that there are those who never heard that ethnologists discovered long ago that these Northern tribes are neither American Indians nor Asians.

Now who are these Aleutian Islanders whom Behring found as he sailed towards the Alaskan coast? They were not known in Asia at that time, but as the population of the world has increased and been more widely scattered, some have settled on Siberian shores. Dr. Boas met several there who admitted they had crossed from Alaska.

Are those Aleuts like or similar to the Amerinds? If so, might it not be that they are faint-hearted stragglers who started off from Asia to the promised land but tarried on the way?

All authorities place them in the same family as the Eskimo. They are not American Indians. They are not original Americans at all. At the discovery of this Con-

continent they were found living in Greenland. As the ages went by, they wandered all over the top of the world, and (as we have seen) Behring found them on the Aleutian Islands. Their wanderings have invariably been towards Asia.

In the *Encyclopedia Britannica* we read: "Although the history of Asiatic origin of the Eskimos was long popular, many of their ethnic peculiarities are opposed to such a notion, and recent researches seem to indicate that their movements have been from east to west."

Fiske holds that the Eskimos are the sole survivors of the cavemen of western Europe, and that their stone arrow-heads, amulets, daggers, bone needles, etc. could go into the caves of England or of France and be indistinguishable from those now found there. It was not a very difficult feat for hardy seamen to cross from Europe centuries ago.

Professor Boyd Dawkins is of the opinion that "they are the sole survivors of the race that made their homes in the Pleistocene caves of western Europe."

The learned Huxley believed that the Eskimo represented an emigrant element from Europe, but called the Red Men indigenous.

Darwin also differentiates them from the Indians.

Winchel says: "The Eskimos are profoundly distinct."

Agassiz says: "The Eskimos differ alike from the Indians and the Mongols of Asia." "The Eskimos differ widely in appearance and habits from the Red Man." (*Standard Cyclopaedia*). "In pronounced ways the Eskimo is as unlike the other inhabitants of America as he is unlike the Siberian." The Eskimo may conceivably be of the Lapp family of Europe. Their ethnic peculiarities are opposed to the notion that they are of Asiatic origin. Nor are they native Americans. They are peculiar as being the only race who certainly had contact with white men before the days of Columbus. The Vikings found them in Greenland. They have wandered ever westward."

Dr. Dall says: "The Esquimos came from the East, and

Humboldt informs us that their name means 'People of the East.' They have always been a maritime tribe. Viking seafarers found Esquimos on the Atlantic coast. So we see that Esquimos first discovered the New World, then the Vikings, then Columbus, and all came from Europe."

Dr. Glidden writes: "The Polar family, which are identical now on both continents, displays one of the strongest possible contrasts with the Aboriginal Americans; and no one can compare the crania of the two, and suppose that one continent was populated from the other through the Eskimo channel." The Red Men of America are farther south, so the sundering wedge is accentuated.

Dr. Rink states: "The Eskimos of Siberia are an offshoot from those of America." It is possible that daring Eskimos had sighted East Cape or even paddled their kayaks across the strait before the days of Behring, but before historic times it is extremely unlikely that any Asiatic native had ever seen the Alaskan coast.

Thus we see that they are not Asians or Amerinds. From the first they have been known as Eskimos. Where we might reasonably look for connecting-link or blending of the Oriental and the American, we find instead a barrier of European emigrants.

The eastern shores of Alaska and Siberia had been superficially explored by the 18th century. By that time, Mongolian exiles had wandered over the pathless steppes. The Czar's kingdom had extended, the population of the world had increased; but even the recent American-Asiatic contact, revealed by the investigations of the Jessup North Pacific Expedition, tells us that the population is as much American as Asiatic.

Settlers from Alaska and incomers from Asia have intermarried, but this mixture is of Eskimo and Oriental.

Its people have gone there in historical times only as the population of the world increased and the call for furs became clamant.

In the interim, Far Eastern shores and peoples have been explored and studied.

Trappers and gold-hunters in late years have (during favorable weather) crossed to and fro, and the first wanderers on both coasts gave for a time added impetus to the old gateway entrance legend. It was noted that the peoples on both sides seemed to blend into one family—which showed an ethnic unity between the two lands. This fact was seized upon as a proof in corroboration of the old decision by those who ignorantly thought that Eskimos were Amerinds. The Red Men of America are farther south, so the sundering wedge is accentuated. No Amerinds are found on the Siberian side.

A recent writer who has lived in Alaska crossed over to Siberian shores, and in his book makes much of the fact that on the Asiatic side he "heard the same chants and could have easily imagined himself still in Alaska." Then—*of course!*—he brings into the story the old "emigration" idea! Proverbially "a little knowledge is a dangerous thing!" With a little more knowledge on his part, he would have known that he was still among *Alaskan* people—so why shouldn't he hear the same sort of chants? Would an intelligent writer conclude that Sweden was peopled from Minnesota just because "Olaf" and "Olga" sang the same songs in each country? Why are so many crude notions published? Why quote the words of these amateurs of race history?

The man was dwelling among the same kind of people as are found on Alaska's shores, and they are neither Amerinds nor Orientals.

The northeastern wastes around East Cape even today are almost unknown and unexplored lands—as is much of Alaska and northern Canada, though the aeroplane has recently done much to map the countries. "Bird men" have viewed hundreds of square miles of land probably still untrodden by human feet. Natives of Point Barrow,

now a thriving settlement, never saw a white man until 1826.

Where it was expected to find a fraternity of men, they discovered strangers of another race and origin, and from an exactly opposite point of the compass. The Eskimos break, rather than propagate the continuity of the human stream.

The "Cape-to-Cape" doorway was a "swinging" one, opening both ways; and it was soon seen that the Siberian population was made up largely of Alaskan natives. As Chambers' Encyclopedia puts it, "The Strait itself has more probably been a channel of migration from America than from Asia." In this connection it is noteworthy that the Tchuktchi people of Siberia regard themselves as a branch rather than as the stem. They point to Alaska as the place from which they were blown.

The footprints on the sands of time point the wrong way! Siberian people of today are like Alaskan natives; and *Alaskans are not Indians!*

Contrary to popular idea Eskimos and Indians have always regarded themselves as separate races. Morgan writes: "The Eskimos do not belong to the Indian family. Their occupation of the American continent in comparison with that of the latter family was recent or modern."

The Behring Sea was, therefore, not the "jumping off place" from the Orient, as there is no blending of races in those latitudes. In the contrary, there is a wedge (as has been noted) between the Asiatic peoples and the American Indian. The Eskimo is of a totally different race, with an entirely different origin.

"Thus the Eskimo, instead of being a connecting-link, forms a barrier between the populations of the two hemispheres at the very point geographically most convenient for effecting the transition." — *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

No, the Amerind did NOT enter America by way of northern Siberia. Have we not prima facie evidence of that?

So here we have an hypothesis, hoary with age, slain by an ugly fact.

Just as we were closing this chapter word came from Archeologist Professors Heizer and S. H. Cook of the University of California, of discoveries there "which upsets the popular assumption that the first humans came to this continent from Asia across a land-bridge which is now the Behring Sea." This news comes from the Smithsonian Institute.

"It is a curious thing, the currency that an idiotic saying can get! The man that first says it thinks he has made a discovery; the man he says it to thinks the same; it departs on its travels, is received everywhere with admiring acceptance, and not only as a piece of rare and acute observation, but as being exhaustively true and profoundly wise; and so it presently takes its place in the world's list of recognized and established wisdoms, and after that no one thinks of examining it to see whether it is really entitled to its high honors or not."

Mark Twain.

CHAPTER V

THE RED MAN IS NOT A YELLOW MAN

Oh, East is East, and West is West,
And never the twain shall meet,
Till Earth and Sky stand presently
At God's great Judgment Seat.

Kipling.

Sensing the absurdity of trying to bring Asians from a land where there were none, (for any humans were at least 1,000 miles from eastern Siberia), some of the more intelligent thinkers began to invent other embarkation points from inhabited lands farther south. When one door was closed, persistency opened another, for the supposed Scriptural necessity for bringing the Amerind from Asia was never lost sight of. The Red Man could not be without genealogy, and such was the multiplicity of ideas that every country of the East, even Egypt, was designated as his birth land.

Glancing through old libraries, one is amused to find that every writer on Indian lore begins by boldly stating that the Red Man came from Asia! Each then propounds his own pet theory as to what part of that continent the Indian came from. So long as they brought him from the Orient, it was anybody's guess as to whence and how.

Some would make the Indian Chinese, while another is certain that he is an offshoot from Egypt.

The diversity of opinion is almost ludicrous, but for many of the theories not one particle of proof is adduced. We're told they just "*had to come*," and that perennial statement was supposed to be axiomatic.

For centuries now it has been customary for every author

who touches upon Indian lore to plagiarize not only the thoughts but even the very words of his predecessor. There has been a vast deluge of repetitive verbiage, but invariably a sort of tacit agreement apparently that the Indian was first to be brought here from Asia. On that *imaginary* foundation the superstructure was to be built! Not one iota of *reason for such an assumption* was deemed necessary!

Since the 17th century those books have multiplied with little or no variation down to the present time. Scientists and laymen, preachers and teachers, have naively propagated the idea. This vain reiteration plainly shows that they do not think it is the truth—they just fancy they do! In reality, they do not THINK on the matter at all! To think only in unison with others is not to THINK at all. When all “think alike” it is a pretty sure sign that no one is really “thinking” very deeply!

Books are made from books. For hundreds of years writers have perpetuated the idea. All of these romancers suggest probable routes by which they *might have* come—but none of them produce an ounce of proof that they *did* so come—or that it was necessary that they should have “come” from anywhere! Not a shred of reason is ever adduced why they “*had to come*”—except that every reader is supposed to believe that from Noah and his sons in Armenia there sprang the whole human race.

Strange to relate, this author has never in all his researches come across a book purporting to give *reasons* for the belief in question, while finding *scores* of authors who simply take the matter for granted! Even H. G. Wells in his marvellous “Outline of History” just introduces us to the American Indian in the words: “who came from Mongolia”! As to *why* America had no population of its own, and *why* he assumes that it had to be peopled from another land, he is strangely silent. Perhaps he does not know.

Is it just a hackneyed expression? Is it just frequently repeated without thought? Has it just become a natural

instinct to take this oft-repeated statement as being correct—as we do so many others? Has it thus been woven into the very fibre of our being? A sentence or two informing us WHY it was imperative that the Americans had to be settled by immigrants, and that the Red Man was not and could not be autochthonous, instead of the customary hackneyed take-for-granted expressions, would have been so enlightening!

We recently wrote to one of the leading ethnologists in New York on this subject; but although we pressed for a reason for the tracing of the Amerind to the Orient, could elicit only the response "It is generally so believed."

Not one glimmer of light has ever been thrown on the belief. On the contrary, the discoveries of 400 years have consistently shown the idea to be as ridiculous as were so many of the other theories current in the Dark Ages.

Persistent attempts to erect a family tree for the Red Race has continued, however, and branched off in many directions.

Dr. Nott writes: "The only race of the Old World with which any connection has been reasonably conjectured is the Mongol, but, to say nothing of the marked difference in physical characters, their language alone should decide against any such alliance."

No philologist can be found to deny the fact that the Chinese are now speaking and writing a language substantially the same as the one they used 5,000 years ago. If the Mongols have preserved a language entire, in Asia, they should likewise have preserved it here, or to say the least, some trace of it. If such imaginary Mongols ever brought their Asiatic speech into this country, it is clear that their fictitious descendants, the Indians, have lost it; and the latter must have acquired, instead, that of some extinct race which preceded a Mongol colonization.

We could well understand that Mongolian people might trek to a new continent if they were assured of better living conditions there. We could even imagine them willing

to brave a journey of thousands of miles through Arctic wastes to reach their Caanan, but that would pre-suppose their knowledge of such a Paradise, and such pre-knowledge is plainly unthinkable. That there are neither Mongolians in America nor Indians in the lands from which they are supposed to have come should be conclusive fact that their homeland is not to be sought there. It is more and more clearly seen that between the Amerind and the Asian there is no relationship." The natural elements of character in the Red Man are pronounced and are the very *antithesis* of the Mongol!

The Red Man may be "Called" Asiatic, but most certainly the name does not equate the nature. As Ridpath writes: "In manners, customs, institutions and character, no two people could be more dissimilar than the American aborigines and the sleepy inhabitants of China." In this, character-analysis concurs.

Pope's dictum still holds true that "the proper study of mankind is man." An ethnic relationship between the Continents referred to cannot be substantiated.

It is time for a "new deal!" We must keep up with the new discoveries. The insistent attempt to link the segregated Amerind with any Oriental race has signally failed. "The American Indian is in too many respects a modified variety of mankind to be thought of as expressing in any serious degree the type of the Mongol or Malay. To group them merely as a branch of those people is to obscure many points of great importance or to ignore them altogether."

When all the would-be solvers of the enigma have been heard, the fact still remains evident that the Red Man *does not resemble* any of the people of the countries wherefrom he has been so consistently and persistently "brought."

It is correctly stated in Funk & Wagnall's Cyclopedia that "The Oriental and the American Indian are as apart as two different races could be. The aborigines of America form one of the most definitely marked-off and strongly-characterized of the different races of men."

Almost a lifetime spent among them shows this to be abundantly the case.

Some of the most eminent ethnologists even go so far as to state that "of all races the Oriental and the Amerind are now found to be the *farthest apart*." Antipodal in character! "Nor can he be considered to be in any degree spiritually a kin to the Oriental mind."

We quote from "The Universal Cyclopedia"—"Physical traits are quite distinct from the peoples of Asia, and are such as to place them (the Amerinds) in a group as separately defined as the negroes of Africa or the whites of Europe. There is no genealogical connection between them. Dr. Winchell writes: "It is impossible to indicate any family of Mongolians to which these people may be affiliated."

No proof of any kinship, whether physical, mental or spiritual, can be noted between any Oriental race and the American aborigines; nor is there extant any record or trace of such. For any mythological evidence thereof the Pantheons of Phoenicia, Egypt, Hindustan, Greece and Rome have been probed to their depths. Surely such all-important knowledge as this would have been could never have been lost, even in the darkest eras of time.

To intelligent minds the thought of such an immigration of Orientals is now inconceivable. It should no longer be a matter of debate.

Ever since the Amerind was discovered there have been persistent attempts to foist him onto Asia. We might as well try to demonstrate that the Niagara Gorge or the Grand Canyon is Asian!

The efforts of all ages have failed to show that the Amerind is anything else than American. The "immigration" legend is not only unproved but *unprovable*—a speculation leading only to a headache!

Herbert Spencer says: "I am conscious that having once become current wrong beliefs of this kind long persist, all disproof notwithstanding."

Ridpath writes: "We had a tradition, to which we gave unanimous support; but as we looked into the matter, we saw that to continue our support, we had to shut our eyes to the plain facts."

In the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, referring to a trans-Pacific origin of the original American, we read: "The practical difficulties involved are so great that one must regard this theory as still unproved."

Many marvellously-fanciful articles have been written to show that the Indian's ancestors came from the Orient, but with no evidence to offer, the theory is as baseless as the fabric of a dream—the survival-thought of a bygone era. The Amerind did not come by any route from any part of Asia.

Long ago, Catlin wisely wrote: "When the science of human ethnology, which has for some thousands of years travelled to the west with the advance of civilization, gets quite around the globe, it will probably be seen whether there has not been some error at its starting-point—error at its base—and consequently error heaped upon error as it has advanced. Whether erroneous dogmas, travelling with the wave of civilization, have not been too much the established rule by which all things ethnological in the new world should be measured; and whether true ethnological knowledge of a people is best drawn from an independent study of those people and their habits, or from the application of an ethnological education drawn from books, made *from other books*, with all the dogmatical rules that have been made for and applied to other peoples? Is it necessary that on the last quarter of the globe a whole continent of human beings, independent and happy in their peculiar modes of life, and never heard of or thought of until the 15th century, should be traced, when discovered, back to the opposite side of the globe? What an ill conceit of civilized man to believe that because his ancestors came from the east, all mankind on a new continent, a new world, must have come from there also! And what a pity for science,

and what a blunder in science, if such a fact be established before it is proved! And what proof of it is there? None whatever!"

The Red Man is no greater problem than is the Caucasian. You may bring him from some Eastern land; but if it is necessary so to do, you must bring yourself likewise. If all came from the one "bundle of life," let scientists begin to speculate when and how we left that natal land and blossomed forth into white creatures. The Blacks and the Whites and the Yellows live almost together in the Old World. The Amerind, on the contrary, had a private hemisphere all his own.

Is it any greater wonder that man was found here than that he should be found everywhere else? Would it not have been stranger still to have found seventeen millions of square miles of God's world *unpeopled*?

The Amerinds were human creatures whose existence Europe and the Eastern world had never even suspected—much less been their point of origin. Their discovery had simply been retarded longer.

There was no more reason in the 16th century to saddle the unique aborigines of America, who had been found inhabiting a world peculiarly their own, in the centre of two oceans, than there had been to declare the Nordics and the Negroes as Asians when they were first discovered.

"It may be asserted with some confidence that there is nothing in the physical and mental condition of the aboriginal American which requires us to postulate for them a foreign origin." *People's Cyclopaedia*.

There is positively nothing on which to base a belief that the Red Man came from anywhere than inherited ideas of Eden and a dispersion therefrom.

Captain Cook discovered Australia. Fortunately for that land it was found in a later age, when saner thinking was the rule, and the Blacks of that country have never been linked up with Asia though they live much nearer to that Continent than the Amerinds. He who created the

Australian along with the kangaroo could likewise create the American Indian along with the llama.

Columbus had discovered not only a new world but a new race of men, who were "objects of intense and inexhaustible interest; who were regarded with as much astonishment as if they had been natives of another planet, so different were they from any race of men hitherto known." (Washington Irving.)

An entirely new chapter in the history of the earth was commenced on the discovery of this new sphere, for another separate, human race had been found.

The country may have been visited before and its people may have been seen, but no one had ever returned therefrom to tell about it. The Red Man's world was beyond the pale even of imagination.

Our school books stated that there were four great races of mankind, namely, the Caucasian, the Mongolian, the Ethiopian and the American.

Before the discovery of America naturally there had been no mention of the Red race, which was not known to exist.

The natives were not necessarily Orientals, but distinct inhabitants of a separate land, just as the Negroes are Africans.

As we are looking into the sources of ancient superstitions, it is amazing indeed to find this idea still holding sway in men's minds.

"Words are things; and a small drop of ink,
Falling like dew upon a thought, produces
That which makes thousands, even millions, think."
—Byron.

Spain's medieval "decision" no longer is considered "vox Dei." As a religious tenet it was all right—if it hadn't been all wrong from an intelligent viewpoint. That they are Asian emigrants is a silly fiction foisted upon the world in a dark age! The inane cliché went out of date with

Deschnew's discovery even though it may be sanctified by long custom. It is plainly foolish *per se*.

It is intensely amusing when Maynard Shipley of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, in his "Americans of a Million Years Ago," so fearlessly assembles his proofs that "man lived in Oklahoma in the age of ice," "man was in this country as early as the Pliocene," and quotes Dr. Osborne as saying (regarding bone implements found in Nebraska): "These fossil artifacts are of indubitably human origin," and he is convinced that they may be "from three to four million years old"; and concludes "Was man—perhaps tool-using man—in America . . . more than a million years ago? Very probably he was." Shipley was on the brink of a great discovery but did not see the significance of it. He was reaching out in the right direction but could not interpret the broad implications of his thoughts and so loses the substance for the shadow, for that same author in the same book writes: "During the first interglacial age men came from Asia, and brought with them the art of skillfully chipping flints." There we leave him.

That a scientist can write such statements as to the age of American man, but persist, nevertheless, in his belief that the Amerind *had to come from Asia*, at some still anterior time, is utterly incomprehensible! That surely is clinging to an old belief with a vengeance! The statements are absurdly inconsistent with each other. Why such slavish reverence for a medieval dictum? But people ridden by an obsession do not think.

Is a pet phrase more important than a fact? Is theory more important than reality? As the children would say in the game "Hide and Seek," Shipley was "getting hot," when speaking of "Americans of a Million years ago," nevertheless, the childish acceptance of a 17th century dogma makes him believe apparently that by some magical means they had crossed the Yellow Sea to get to America! Think of two such thoughts in such amazingly close jux-

taposition! He surely has the Asian complex and has it "bad" to imagine such a paradox! If friend Shipley et al, found that inhabitants had dwelt in America on the afternoon of the first day of creation, they would still feel impelled to fetch them from Asia—where they had been created or had evolved that very morning.

It is hard for many to emancipate themselves from age-old conclusions. The grooves these walk in are too deep. Tradition clings tenaciously.

How pathetic it is to see men clutching vainly at this or that ridiculous idea to prove their childhood teaching.

To quote J. Alden Mason of the Philadelphia Museum: "Popular theories of old world origin for them are universally discounted by the best authorities."

One of the most inane questions so frequently asked concerning the Indian is "Where did they come from? How the deuce did they get here?" If a volcanic island of recent eruption is found to be later on inhabited, it would be an intelligent question to ask whence the people had come, but to ask the same question regarding the natives of a continent known to be millions of years old is ridiculous. When new tribes were found by Livingstone in Africa, did the world wonder how they got there? Because our grandparents settled in America is no criterion that the Red Man had to stem from somewhere else. He did not have to come. He was here! He had never been anywhere else. America has always been his ancestral soil.

It is quite within the realm of possibility that some day communication may be established with other worlds. Shall our first radioed question be: "How did you get there from Asia?"

The author had the honor of discovering a tribe of Indians in South America which hitherto had been unknown. In a moment of thoughtlessness he asked, "Where did you come from?" and blushed with shame when an aged native responded (when translated into English), "Uh! Where

did *you* come from? *We* have been here since the beginning!"

Intelligent thinkers everywhere are recognizing the fact that the copper-skinned race first glimpsed from the deck of the "Santa Maria" is a true "*homo Americanus*," unalloyed to any other. He is not a man who vacated his yellow skin and took on a red one in its place.

For 400 years the status of the poor Amerind has been in a state of flux, but he who once owned a world of his own exclusively is past caring what the white man's speculations make him out to be. He knows the Great Spirit made him in an American Eden—that he lived here ages before we ever knew his homeland existed. The *world* was the stage on which man was placed.

The Amerinds' family tree has been variously sought in practically every country, but all attempts to find any foreign source of his genesis have proved negative, and always will. He is still, and always will remain an orphan unclassified. His Father and Mother was God, and he was created a nucleus in a microcosm of his own, which he still inhabits. In that respect he is unique, but no more so than is the Black, the Yellow and the White. His peculiar uniqueness is that he was not discovered until thousands of years later than the other types.

The great ancient empires of the East were founded by men who had never even imagined that in the northwest portion of their own world there lived Nordic savages; but in later centuries the Roman world found such.

If a few entirely contrasting fair-haired Vikings could remain hidden for so long in a corner of Europe, which Continent is no larger than the Brazil of today, it is not so wonderful after all that the Amerinds should have remained in seclusion, separated as they were by undreamed of rolling seas. Also, what of the African tribes only discovered in our lifetime? We naturally presume them to be as old as we ourselves.

When scientists began to look into the question seriously,

they saw that the Amerínd could not be classified with any Asiatic race. Darwin declared that the Indian was "distinct." Hawthorne writes, "we can establish no trustworthy connection between them and any Asiatic race. If they emigrated hither from another continent, why do their remains not indicate their source? The more keenly we strive to penetrate their mystery, the more perplexing does it appear; the further we investigate them, the more alien from anything we are or have known do they seem. Elusive as mist, and questionable as night. After an intercourse of 400 years, we know as little of them as we did at first."

Many thinking men have recently given it as their opinion that the country-of-origin of the Amerind is an insoluble question. It is noteworthy that even conjecture seems exhausted during the past few decades. The glib assertion handed down for centuries and paraphrased by so many writers is now seen to be a foolish and uncalled-for dogma, which, because hoary with age, grew into a settled, unquestioned belief.

For many years there have been many students who saw serious objections to this theory; but a strange and unaccountable apathy seems to have characterized even those perceiving the absurdity thereof. What did it matter anyway? Why stir up a dead issue? Who was interested? Why attack such a sacrosanct "decision?" After 400 years of smug satisfaction it is hard to re-think.

However, since that early assumption there have always been dissenters, and it is enheartening to find ethnologists in every land now joining in the belief that the American Indian is *American*—and that he always has been such.

Is it not possible that the Amerind is just as much native to America as the Negro is to Africa? By what logic or line of argument must we conclude that he is a colonist?

Why should be relegate America to the position of a "spare part" of the surface of the earth—a sort of "No Man's Land"—a country whereto the people *had to come*?

Is it to be supposed that the Creator left this half-world

fallow, reserved for cultivation by us His "Chosen People?" What a lack of imagination it is to think that whereas man appeared on all the *other* parts of the globe, this western half remained without a man to till the soil until comparatively modern times, when a few emigrants are supposed to have blundered here from Asia or Europe or Atlantis. They did not need to come. They were here.

To find a Red Man in America was no greater mystery than it was to find a White Man in Northern Europe, or a Black Man in Africa, or a Yellow Man in Asia.

Prescott, in his *Conquest of Peru*, writes: "It may safely be predicted that no discoveries that may be made will ever establish the thought of a communication of some remote period between the two hemispheres. It may be doubted, indeed, whether the whole inquiry, so persistently pursued, has not sprung from an illusion. Had the eastern continent been discovered by the western, it would perhaps have been assumed that the latter had furnished those swarms which passed through Asia to Europe, and that here was the original seat of the human family.

The Continent of America, when first explored, was found to be the home of many tribes, but Humboldt tells us: "They all exhibit the clearest evidence of belonging to the same great branch of the human family." As the *Americana* puts it: "The most divergent are no more than subvarieties of American man. This unity is the ethnic phenomenon of American aboriginal history."

Dr. J. Kollman, the Swiss anatomist, tells us that "The variety of man in America at the close of the glacial period had the same facial form as the Indian of today; and the racial traits which distinguish him now, did also at that time."

Morton writes of "the universal type."

Dellenbaugh speaks of the "ethnic unity" of the American race.

Dr. Brinton says that "The earliest Americans, those who were contemporaries of the fossil horse and other long-

since extinct quadrupeds, possessed the same racial character as the natives of the present day, with similar skulls and a like physiognomy."

Dr. Cook of Yale writes that "There is nothing to show that the human type was different in ancient times."

The united voice of all scholars is that the whole Amerind people from Canada to Patagonia are *one* and have been such from time immemorial.

"He who has seen one tribe of Indians has seen all, for whether we find him in Canada or in Chile, he is an Indian still, and cannot be mistaken for a being of any other race." Nott.

We must allow then that the people who occupied this country in those remote times, were of the same race as those who inhabited it at the time of the conquest.

Dr. Morton writes: "I can aver that all the American nations, excepting the Esquimaux, are of one race, and that this race is peculiar and distinct from all others. I regard the American Nations as the true autochthones, the primeval inhabitants of this vast continent. The American nations, excepting the Polar tribes, are of one race and one species."

As related in *Funk & Wagnall's Cyclopedia*: "From Canada to Argentina, they are essentially one and the same people throughout."

The white man is a multiple blending of many nations. The Red Man is one man singular—not a different *species* only but a wholly different *race*!

As Humboldt rightly says: "The nations of America, except those which border on the Polar Sea, form a single race, characterized by the color of the skin."

Also, as observed by Keith in *The Antiquity of Man*, "The oldest human remains so far discovered, both of the northern and southern parts of the western hemisphere, are of the same American-Indian type. Indeed the resemblance between the skulls recovered from deposits of a Pleistocene Age in the United States and those found in

the Pampean deposits of the Argentine Republic is very striking. They are not only of the same race; they might belong to the same tribe."

In *Essays of an Americanist*, Dr. Brinton writes: "We reach, therefore, the momentous conclusion that the American race, from its earliest appearance in time, is and has been one as distinct in type as any other race."

"The American race is essentially separate and peculiar, whether we regard it in its physical, moral, or in its intellectual relations, possessing peculiar moral and physical characteristics in utter contrast with any people of the Old World." Dr. Morton.

"Not a tongue, habit, custom, myth or idea, found among the aborigines of America by Columbus, can be traced back to any anterior communication with other inhabitants of our planet. They are distinct from every race of the Old World in features, languages, customs, arts, religions and propensities. The American race differs essentially from all others, not excepting the Mongolian. They bear no resemblance to any race of the Old Continent, though it has been customary to seek a foreign origin for the inhabitants." Dr. Glidden.

So, recognizing the wide gulf which separates the Amerind from any Asiatic people of today, scientists are now looking farther back and are asserting that the Red Man came from the Old World at a time prior to the final settlement of the Empires of the East; and that the Indians are descendants of some pre-Asiatic race who crossed from Asia before the present Asians inhabited the land. So, evidently, they still *HAD TO COME* from somewhere else!

Such is the clinging power of an obsession!

There seems to be a deep and dark conspiracy to bring, by hook or by crook, our friend the Amerind from *Asia*! Now, we're assured he's pre-Mongolian! Pity poor barren America! She just had to "adopt" a "family!"

Now what about the notion held by some that the Amer-

ind is the offspring of scattered remnants of storm-tossed mariners?

It would, of course, be foolish for us to say that waifs of the sea have not from time in the course of the ages been washed upon American shores; but to say that prehistoric man *peopled a Continent in that way* is preposterous! Such an idea could only be advanced by the thoughtless, because the lowest estimate we might give of the number of the aborigines found at the time of the discovery of America would be fifty million! Deeke's *History of the Indians* gives the population as being one hundred million! As we have already noted, the entire population of Europe in the year 1500 was but fifty million.

Naturally, in the frequent stormy gales, we may conclude that individuals or small groups were driven by contrary winds and currents in wandering barques from Asia to America. Such instances are not rare even in our own day. That might be sufficient to give the Japanese cast of countenance to some of our northwest Indians; but God's winds blow west as well as east, and it would be just as plausible to argue that the Jap is an Indian as it is to infer that the northwest Indian is a Jap, or that the Greenlander is a Viking because Leif Ericson touched there!

What maritime nation is *not* similarly visited? A country stretching from Pole to Pole on two coasts must in the course of ages have received many such visitants, just as Asia must have given asylum to many Indians; but America was not peopled by odds and ends of humanity that had just filtered in on the seaboard, like visitors from Mars.

The truth remains that if life in any form migrated here it was only additions to the life already existing on this hemisphere since the creation.

All of these widely-divergent and isolated cases simply mean that although undoubtedly men arrived on these shores in ancient times, they were almost certainly storm-tossed mariners who, like the Vikings, left no marked impress, but just mingled with the real inhabitants of the land.

Stranded creatures from "parts unknown" did not populate America!

The Amerind is not the result of casual castaway on its far-flung shores, "driftwood" from either west or east! He is not a "mongrel" tribe, made up of various tattered peoples from time to time washed up on these coasts! He is a *distinct race* and *not* a heterogeneous mixture! They are not scattered specimens of other nations, but are one distinct and separate type of Red Man, sharply defined.

Washington Irving writes: "Whether in old times, beyond the reach of history or tradition, there existed an intercourse between the opposite shores of the Atlantic must ever remain matters of vague and visionary speculation. Except for some involuntary voyagers to America or from America, it is highly improbable that there was any intercourse between the two continents."

For uncounted ages human life went on in this western hemisphere, uninfluenced by and unknown to the eastern half of our planet. One might almost say that the Amerind lived in another dimension, utterly unconscious of the fact that beyond those seemingly-boundless oceans laving their shores there dwelt other mortals, like them, and at the same time wholly unlike them in many vital respects, who likewise had never even imagined the existence of their Continent—much less its being inhabited by another (and red colored) race!

The pre-Mongolian idea was hailed as a new thought, and it caused a great deal of comment. As in Columbus' case, its author was a first discoverer but did not know it. It was given to him to find out more than he could grasp, previously-imbibed ideas precluding his understanding the fundamental truth thereof. The man could not emancipate himself from old teachings. The pre-Mongolian discoverer had stumbled on a new world of thought; but the archaic idea that the Red Man must be brought from somewhere—that he could not possibly be autochthonous—held him enchained. He could not rid himself of 400 years of in-

herited belief! How near one can come to the truth and yet miss it altogether! The man did not realize where the discovery was leading him.

The Amerind is indeed "pre-Mongolian" in a very real sense! Of his past history we know little, but several facts stand out plainly, and one of them is his "pre"-ness! The Red Man was in "America" before the Chinese, Japanese or Egyptian Empires came into being! The Amerind is "PRE" them all!

What and who were the pre-Mongolians of Asia? We have a few specimens left in the mountains of northern Japan—the "Hairy Ainus"—the most *hirsute* people alive today! The Caucasian and the Australian Black share with them the doubtful honor of being the hairiest of all the human race—a peculiar, animal-like trait. All of these, however, have *wavy* hair, while the hair of the Indian is straight and he is also the least hairy of all the sons of men! If man descended from some hairy creature, then we three races have still to "evolve" the fungus off!

The hairless Amerind is most assuredly not descended from the Ainus.

In the interior of China there is an independent territory inhabited by Lolos, the old aborigines of the country. A traveler in that region writes: "They are totally unlike the Chinese and show every indication of Caucasion blood." So the pre-Chinese are also ruled out.

A scientist who kindly read our manuscript writes: "The fact that the African, the Indian, and the Aryan differ in the marked degree you have pointed out, undoubtedly proves that the separation which led to different evolutions must have taken place *before* mankind was fully evolved. Therefore the Indian may in this sense be regarded as an original creation. He probably did not evolve from any other race at present inhabiting the globe."

It is not surprising therefore to find the most recent writer we have read now claiming that: "As the Amerind shows no affinity with any present-day Asiatic races, he is

probably the offspring of some pre-Mongolian people who crossed over to America before the Yellow tribes settled in Asia."

One author says: "The tendency of modern research is to prove the great antiquity of American civilization as well as of the American people. If either was drawn from a foreign source, it was at a time so remote as to antedate all old world culture now existing, and to prevent any light being thrown on the offspring by a study of the parent stock."

Truly the Red Man is an older type than the Mongolian. History and research show very plainly that the Amerind occupied America before Mongolians entered either China or Japan, so it is very obvious that Mongolians could not overflow into America.

Prof. L. Taylor Hansen in a very recent publication answers all believers in the Mongolian derivation of the Amerind until "their mouths are stopped with dust," when he writes: "If, as most students of the American Indian insist at present, they came from Asia, how can we explain the migration of a long-headed people from an essentially round-headed stock? This is the riddle which reduces the theory that Asia was the origin of the Amerind into an anthropological absurdity."

TECUMSEH'S SPEECH TO GOVERNOR HARRISON

(1813)

"I am a Shawnee. My forefathers were warriors. I am the maker of my own fortune; and oh that I could make that of my Red people and of my country as great as the conceptions of my mind. When I think of the Spirit that rules the universe, the being within, commencing with past ages, tells me that once, nor until lately, there was no white man on this continent; that it then all belonged to red men, children of the same parents, placed on it by the Great Spirit

that made them to keep it, to traverse it, to enjoy its protection, and to fill in with the same race. Once a happy race: since made miserable by the white people."

CHAPTER VI

WAS THE SPRING BOARD IN EUROPE?

“Nothing remains of unrecorded ages
That lie in the silent cemetery of time;
Their wisdom may have shamed our wisest sages,
Their glory may have been indeed sublime.”

We find a few other thinkers, with some originality in their make-up, loath to let go of the inherited belief that the Amerind just had to come from other shores, veering around to the idea that his route hither was the shorter one via Europe. Well, it is a shorter route, as any map of the world will show.

So, as a welcome relief from the stereotyped statement that the Indian is of Oriental origin, we are now being told by scientists that he is *European*; that the stream of life was westward and not eastward; and that their civilization was very similar to those of the early Neolithic period of Denmark and the later Paleolithic period of southern Europe.

Dr. Hrdlicka long claimed that the American Indian migrated from Northeast Asia not more than three thousand years ago. For some time there was a Hrdlicka school of thought that would listen to no other teachings. However, more recently that eminent scientist has arrived at the conclusion that the Redskins of our plains are descendants of the Cro-Magnon men of Europe, a conviction forced upon him by a study of the skulls of the prehistoric men of Europe and because of the many recent discoveries. If the Amerind positively *must* be extraneously linked up his nearest type is in Europe. Those who insist that the American Indian had to come from *somewhere*, and could not

possibly be autochthonous, might with some show of reason bring him from Europe.

Professor Field of Princeton, with Doctors Ulrich and Resser of the U. S. National Museum, recently proved the existence of an ocean "bridge" in ancient times which joined Scotland and America together! In "Prehistoric Europe," Professor Geikie writes: "Across the Atlantic one might have walked dry-shod." It is definitely indicated by geological "finds" that at one time the Atlantic Ocean was "bridged" by land, and the Egyptian priests had legends as to the destruction of that land, so at least there is ground for such an assumption.

Even as late as Viking days, there existed a volcanic island midway between Iceland and Greenland known to the Norsemen as "Gunnbjorns Skerries," which they say disappeared about 1456. Also news comes from Oslo that Greenland is sinking into the Ocean. Professor Vogt of the University of Trondheim says such sinking is showing plainly. Settlements of the early Norwegian Vikings are today covered by water, and it is certain that the shape and size of the continent has changed. Every decade brings clearer proof that much of the western ocean is new sea.

Dr. Carlos de la Torre of Havana advances the theory that once dry land joined Yucatan and Cuba. It is generally conceded that the Mexican Gulf was comparatively recently a part of America; and Mayan legends of a flood are exceedingly numerous. The Mayas say "Atl, who upholds the sky," was angry with them and crushed their land into the waters."

Much of history is fiction, but much of fiction is history! Where there are clouds of smoke there is usually some fire; and the legends of olden days are frequently the "embalmed relics of ancient facts.

Donelly in "Atlantis" devotes some 500 pages to show that the American Indians and also the Europeans are most certainly emigrants from "the first home of mankind—

"Atlantis," the supposedly ancient island now sunk beneath the ocean.

We have personally noted that the Azores Islands are covered with volcanic ashes and lava.

Any sign of original thinking is welcome, after so much parrot-like repetition of Asian antecedents. Any suggestion that will help break the spell of medieval legend is a sign of progress. Donelly is a man of one idea—but give us men with one idea of their own rather than men with naught in their heads but the ideas gleaned from others! We could, we confess, wish that the "evidence" that Donelly adduces were more "evidential"! Why a Continent which stretches from Pole to Pole and is as wide as the Atlantic Ocean should have to be populated from an *island*, he does not inform us! We can imagine with what confidence he would bring out another edition of his book *Atlantis* if he were alive today, for oceanographers are discovering that parts of the Atlantic were dry land less than 15,000 years ago; that the ocean bed is still in motion; and that it is now 9,000 feet higher in some parts than before. The Western Union Telegraph Company reports that the ocean bed has arisen nearly two and a quarter miles since the cable was laid 25 years ago—and in so doing has broken their cable! Will the "drowned" island of "Atlantis" reappear one of these days above the rolling waves and reveal to future ages some of its long-buried secrets?

If Donelly's claims as to "Atlantis" were substantiated, it would make America one of the first lands to be peopled. All of this is pure conjecture; but it is significant that Thompson in his book *The People of the Serpent* refers to legends of the Mayans relating to Atlantis, and the arrival of *other races among them*. Note, however, that all who found lodgment upon American shores invariably found autochthonous people dwelling there! There may be some of the seed of Atlantis in this western world; but if Atlantean men came here, they found American men already calling it their home!

It is not at all impossible that a few storm tossed Amerinds discovered and landed on the Spanish Peninsula. If that conjectured land existed in the Atlantic such a supposition is credible. If any of them settled there, we could imagine the old Basques as their descendants or half descendants. The Basques of France and Spain, among whom we have tarried call themselves "The people from Beyond." By ethnologists they are styled Cro-Magnons, and are also frequently referred to as aborigines of Atlantis. They seem to have been transplanted from time immemorial on the soil of Spain and are still beheld distinct from all other men. Scientists trace them back for at least 3,000 years, but even today they remain utterly alien as though they might have had another worldly origin. They are known as the most ancient of all the people of Europe, and probably helped load Solomon's "Ships of Tarshish." Their language is absolutely different from any Old World tongue, and more closely resembles American languages than any other. This language, preserved in a corner of Europe, by a few thousand mountaineers is the sole remaining fragment of some dead tongue. It stands out alone of its kind, surrounded by idioms whose modern construction bear no analogy to it. In recent centuries many Basques, though retaining their own tongue, have learned the Castilian and adopted Spanish names. Some of them voyaged with Columbus to the New World. It would be an amazing coincidence if the descendants of some old Amerinds helped in the unveiling of their ancient world to later Europeans. This theory may ever remain extremely visionary, though it is still possible that those petroglyphs on rocks of the Biscayan coast may yet be deciphered. Dr. Knox writes: "Primitive races like the Basques, of whom little is known, yet may in remote ages, have played a conspicuous figure on the earth before Sahara was a desert, or the Atlantic a sea."

Because Spanish Armada ships were wrecked upon Irish shores, and some of the fortunate survivors found refuge

in Ireland does not make "Paddy" a Spaniard! It would rather cause him to fight at the very suggestion!

Surely there can be none who would affirm that the basis of animal and human life in these lands was laid by some early drifters washed up on the shores! The idea that the *millions* of inhabitants found here were the result thereof is fantastic in the extreme. To imagine that a band of shipwrecked persons could contribute as large a population to a new Continent as there was in the land they had left, long before the days of recorded history, is absurd!

Wiggam in his book points out that all of the descendants of the Pilgrim fathers alive today could return to England in the "Mayflower," so they haven't been so very prolific.

If there were infiltrations of people from Asia or from Europe to America, there were surely castaways from America to other lands; but neither had any more effect on the racial population than would the occasional marriage of an African with a Caucasian. In the mass, it is negligible. The moot question cannot be settled by invoking the idea of an accidental colonization by wanderers or a shipwrecked company! Any such unfortunates were either received hospitably by the original inhabitants or they were put to death! One swallow doesn't make a summer.

Apart from a few isolated cases there was no pre-Columbian intercourse. An occasional canoe may have reached these shores, but the racial significance of such would be negligible. The Amerind comes from no such precarious source.

This writer feels certain that whatever accessions may have come to, or gone from, the Western Hemisphere in millenniums past, there is abundant proof that the American continent was populated as early as was the Old World.

Perhaps the most preposterous of all the beliefs which every once in too often crops up in magazines and newspapers is this notion that the Amerind is the descendant of the Ten Lost Tribes of Israel. Such an idea was conceived without thought and is plainly accepted without thought.

Those tribes were not lost until historical times, or around 583 B.C., and the Museum of Natural History of New York recently announced the discovery of the petrified remains of a man who lived in Florida as long ago as 20,000 years. So America was inhabited, and many centuries passed before the Hebrews knew of its existence. America may be the land of their dreams now, but it was Caanan which was their first "Promised Land." Also, think of Jews trading Manhattan Island for \$24! Not a very kosher deal for Semites!

All such curious guesses are foolishness in the face of facts. It is an insult to the intelligence of the reading public to mention them. What a lamentable lack of thought is shown by so many would-be solvers of the Indians' origin. Even credibility was not considered necessary.

It would be easy to multiply sources from which the Red Man is said to have come, and to retail the ingenious (not to say ingenuous) conjectures whereof he has been the subject—voyagers from Wales—from Ireland—the early Druids who built Stonehenge in England and cavemen of Europe.

We might with some little show of reason speculate that Carthaginian ships may have visited or been driven to America some four thousand or more years ago. There are peculiar inscriptions on rocks up the Amazon River and also what appears to be the carving of a Phoenician ship, to lend color to such a supposition. A landing of this kind is possible, but none of those seafarers were Mongoloids, nor did they come from Eastern shores; and the deep, underlying fact still stands that centuries before the keel of the first Phoenician ship was laid, the original "American" was inhabiting this land.

If it could be proved that the Indian could not have been created or evolved in Amercia, then why not bring him in a possible way, say over a land-bridge from Europe, as suggested by Dr. Hrdlicka? For the sake of sweet reason,

let the route be a feasible one! There were people in Europe, there were none in Siberia.

But surely there are none who could claim that the Red man is akin to the European in any way, physically, mentally or spiritually.

The Amerind has an individualism sharply defined. Lewis Spence tells us that "The difference between the viewpoint, mundane and spiritual, of the Red Man and that of the European is as vast as that which separates the conceptions and philosophies of the east and west." No amount of verbal magic can ever correlate the Amerind with any other race.

Notwithstanding the almost universal Asian complex adherents, there are many to whom the decision is heavy with confusion. They remember that the Mongols have never been seafaring people, while the Amerind has always been at home in his canoe. The early Spaniards found sea-going ships trading on the coasts, and they wonder, could it be possible after all that we have neglected to consider that the route of entry might have been from Europe and not Asia, which is so much nearer and easier? So we find many who look with favor on the new speculation—*From Europe to America*. The Red Man must be stemmed back to somewhere.

First the American Indian is aboriginal, living in his own isolated Continent. Next, he is "discovered" and pronounced "Asian." Later on, savants declare that he is of European stock. Then comes along Donnelly, who tells us that he is neither Oriental nor European, but Atlantean, and that all mankind originated there. Yes, the "they-had-to-come-from-somewhere" idea clings tenaciously!

One nameless writer tells us that when people of Asia arrived in America, and had penetrated as far as the State of Illinois, they found people of a Negroid cast already living there! To those recently found creatures he gives the name of "Black Sand Men." Those people, he informs us, "had elongated skulls, unlike those of the Red Men.

He tells us that many of the Black Sand Men have been discovered and that the skulls differentiate them from the Indians—"who came later." The writer in question gives no data other than the shape of the head to indicate a difference of race!

Even though a family of undoubted Negro descent was found in American territory, are we therefore to infer that the country was populated by black men? It is quite possible that shipwrecked Negroes may have been cast upon eastern shores. It is likewise possible that they could have made their way to Illinois. But to deduce from such "evidence" that a Negroid race inhabited that state, well, as the French would say "c'est a rire"!

The supposition that any other race preceded the Red Man in America is directly contrary to the established facts. There is a seemingly impenetrable wall of mystery surrounding his genesis. He is the world's "Sphinx-like" riddle. On one point, however, all savants agree, without a dissenting voice, namely that no other kind of human being than he inhabited America prior to 1492. On that point there is no room for discussion. It's not debatable. Science writes:

"We have seen no evidence to lead us to suppose that any race preceded the American Indian in the new world." The American Man, all agree in stating, has characteristics peculiar to himself alone.

How could Negroes come from Asia? A band of them might have been washed up from Africa.

Early in 1600, as we have seen, the Spaniards began to import slaves from Africa. Is it possible that one or more of those early slave ships was driven north and wrecked on what are now United States shores?

Did some of those Africans, or other Africans escaping from Spaniards further south, somehow find their way into Illinois? It is not quite incredible. But they were comparatively recent arrivals and surely could not or should not have been mistaken for pre-Amerinds.

Is that the answer to the riddle of our unknown discoverer of African remains?

The oldest Indian found in American soil is the same type as the Amerind of today. From creation's morn the Red Man had been the only inhabitant. That is a fact as universally proved and accepted as that the earth is a sphere. The "Black Sand" Negroes of Illinois are built up of moonshine. We also read references, from time to time, of white Indians. This writer has travelled in their country, which for centuries was the highway of the old Spanish gold route from Peru to Spain. Thousands of these Indians, men and women, carried those loads of looted gold. Any student of Spanish colonial history well knows how the added white shade came to their epidermis.

It must surely have been an awesome sight, away back in the childhood of the world, when first a black-skinned "caveman" caught sight of a white human! Did he run in terror, we wonder, as from some new species of wild animal! Of such meeting we have no record.

Many, many centuries had passed, and eastern nations had risen to great heights and the Grecian and Roman Empires succeeded them before the fair-haired blonds of north-western Europe emerged to awe and surprise them by their utter strangeness and dissimilarity to anything theretofore encountered. We have no date of that revealing; but the emergence of the Red Man into our ken was, of course, at the time of the discovery by Columbus.

While on the subject of the Black Man, the Negro was a very early comer to America. The Spaniards imported African slaves to the New World during the lifetime of Columbus—some were perhaps kings in Africa, one hundred and twenty years before the Mayflower arrived. It is also an historical fact that the next appearance in North American waters was when she came from Africa with a cargo of slaves. We know that black slaves were later brought to Illinois, and of course many died there, but to mistake such recent comers as pre-Amerinds is inexcusable.

Meanwhile the Red Man sits in stolid silence, much more concerned about his future than his past. It is estimated that there are in America today natives of every country on the globe, but none other than the Red Man can truly say:

"I am an American."

Perhaps we should show more love to these precedent people from now on. We care for a blind old dog until he dies; how much more for our geographical ancestors whose inheritance we prize so highly.

But, the orthodox reader queries: If the native peoples of the Western Hemisphere did not enter America from either east or west whence come they? This is not a religious work, but as there are many millions of people who believe in the Scriptures, and a comparatively non-existent few who do not, any attempt at solving the ancestry of the Red Man should rightly include the Mosaic account of creation. What does the Bible teach regarding the distribution of man on the earth? In that Book the Creator Himself answers the age-old question of how mankind was settled in the western as well as the eastern hemisphere. In our next chapter we shall show that God created a *populous* for the earth, of which America is a part.

THE UNIVERSAL CREATION

"So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them."

THE AMERICAN-INDIAN CREATION

"At first there was but the shoreless sea and the clear sky; then a tiny cloud appeared away off, which gradually increased in size, finally attaining large proportions. This proved to be our Creator, Who then planted the germs of human creatures in the earth in the form of small wooden figures. From these figures we finally grew here."

CHAPTER VII

THE UNIVERSAL CREATION

“Read not to contradict and confute;
Nor to believe and take for granted;
Nor to find talk and discourse;
But to weigh and consider.”

Francis Bacon.

It is remarkable that Holy Writ presents the only record of the creation of universal man. The many and varied accounts of the origin of man, which all ancient nations had, are all records of their own private beginnings.

Genesis I is a narrative that stands alone. In every respect it is unique. That inspired word will live as long as time endures.

The story starts out with the words, “In the beginning, God.” Hebraists all agree that here there should be a period. The writer then goes on to tell us what the Self-Existent One did, and recounts the birthday of the world; goes on to the creation of insects, birds and beasts, and culminates with the creation of man. Male and female created He them.

Scientifically, the description is perfect. Geologically, it is entirely consonant with the known facts, if we make the Hebrew word “yom” to mean “period”—which it can just as well do as to mean “day” (twenty-four hours’ duration). Ethnologically, it is as lucid as light.

Thus Jehovah breaks the silence of eternity and speaks to all peoples and to all times. The record is ageless as it is dateless. A God-like narrative! No human thought or language is here. The glory, the majesty, and the music of the recital is divine. No human intelligence will ever be

able to advance a more lucid or understandable account of creation for man to believe.

If any portion of the Bible can claim to be super-inspired, it must be that of this declaration contained in Genesis I. No human eye saw, no human ear heard, when Jehovah broke the silence of a past eternity in creative acts. This is the music of the spheres.

It is generally believed that God revealed this declaration to "my servant Moses." That illustrious Hebrew, born in Egypt in 1600 B.C., of Jewish parentage, was probably the most scholarly of all the Jews. It is said of him that he spent forty years being instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, that he spent forty years learning the wisdom of God, when Jehovah revealed to him the deathless creation record which should supersede all the many legends of creation then extant. Hence it is written of Moses that he could see "Him who is invisible."

It is intriguing to notice that the act of this Spirit-God was first revealed to an Egyptian Jew and probably first recorded in the picture language of that country. That this declaration of God was to stand as the first caption of Holy Scripture, and take precedence of the crude ideas of the Creator which the Jews had believed for thousands of years prior to its revelation, is significant.

Genesis I is the creation story, a sublime, inspired account of the works of the Infinite God, Who by the word of His mouth created life to inhabit the earth which He had made—insect-kind, fish-kind, bird-kind, beast-kind, and man-kind.

The narrative is the briefest summary of the most stupendous piece of work—creative work—that time has ever known. The earth, which was dark, Jehovah made light; He made the dry land to appear, and He made the seas. He brought forth grasses and fruits. He made the sun and the moon to afford light and heat to the earth He had made. He made the creeping things for the earth and fowls to fly over the earth. He made the beasts and the cattle. To crown all, he then created man to have dominion over these

things of the earth. "So God created man in his own image."

For a season on Chautauqua we lectured with Mr. Bryan, who made a great deal of the words: "In His Image," in all of his speeches, but seemed to forget that God is Spirit. Spirit can have no image, therefore "In His Image" means his spiritual nature.

And God said, we read, "Let the earth bring forth." "And the earth brought forth."

Note that there is no mention of any locale except "the earth," nor is there any mention of the number of birds, beasts, or humans created.

Brief as is the story, we have its chronology—"In the beginning"—and the geography of it—"the earth."

Thus the whole *earth* was given herbage and living creatures—insect-kind, fowl-kind, and man-kind.

Here then in a few sublime words, man is instructed regarding the first beginnings, the primal origin of all things, animate and inanimate, from the lowest forms of life up to man.

This is the alphabet of creation. The keystone of the whole work.

And God said, "Let us make man," plainly meaning men, or mankind (populous), as we would write. The Hebrew never assumes any change to mark the dual or plural numbers, *men*. If this Genesitic account does not mean *man-kind*, but *man* in the singular, then there was no female. How then in the next breath do we read, let *them* have dominion? and in the following verse we read that *they* were to be fruitful and multiply? R. Payne Knight, the great Helenist, rightly tells us therefore, that the true Hebrew rendering of those pregnant words are, "And God said let us make the universality of the man," as before He had made the universality of insects, birds and beasts. The Hebraist will concede that to be the true translation.

A cursory perusal, putting out of our minds all preconceived ideas as to numbers and location (and any other

account) would naturally lead us to believe that God populated this earth with living things everywhere.

There is in the text positively nothing to cause us to think otherwise as to the distribution of mankind. No other conclusion can we come to from an understanding perusal of text, unless (although there is really no "unless" about the matter) we weave into it the other story, which, thus far, to our minds is non-existent. Let us not tinge the record with what isn't there. The recital needs no interpretation. An "interpretation" is frequently more of an "invention" than an exegesis of the passage!

The statements are definite. The language used is too concise to have any other meaning read into it.

This chapter need be a very short one. There is no reason to do more than draw the reader's attention to the plain words of Holy Writ, which intelligently instructs us how God made a world of living creatures, including mankind (populous).

From a fair perusal of this genetic narrative, no reader could arrive, intelligently, at any conclusion other than that Jehovah made a world of living creatures to inhabit the earth which He had made.

The author of Acts 17-26 bears this out: "And He made from one every nation of men to live on the face of the earth, having determined allotted periods and the boundaries of their habitation."

Reading the story for the first time, and ignoring any other account, the reader concludes therefrom that both animals and humans were created in indefinite numbers. "Male and female created He them." "Them" is applicable to a million as well as to "two." "Them" is not of necessity limited to one pair. That conclusion is only in the mind of the reader who has Adam and Eve in view. There is no mention of the number, and there is thus no call to conclude that "man" was not also created a world-citizen, with the lower animals. No hint here of a one-pair creation of insects, fishes, birds, beasts, or humans is given,

nor is such in the slightest degree implied. No intelligent reader can find it there even by implication. No Eden is mentioned. No first pair of Adam and Eve is introduced, nor is Asia referred to or in any way implied as being the scene of this display of divine power.

In the first chapter of Genesis, we have then a general account of a universal creation. Admitting that fact, and not "reading into" the inspired record anything not mentioned or implied, many otherwise obscure passages in the succeeding chapters of the Bible are quite comprehensible. If this be ignored, however, passages are frequently incomprehensible or misleading. The acceptance and use of this "key" unlocks the door to much of what cannot otherwise be explained, and makes lucid the subsequent references to other peoples, and obviates the contradictions there would otherwise be.

The truth that man was created a world citizen was held for centuries. The early church knew it, and it was believed in by the illustrious fathers.

St. Clement, in his "Epistle to the Corinthians," had written of "other worlds beyond the ocean"; and St. Augustine had penned the words: "As by God's command at the time of the creation, the earth brought forth the living creature after his kind, so a similar process must have taken place in islands too remote to be reached by animals from the continents."

The "hinterlands" of the earth always held mystery for the ancients.

The words of Christ "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold" were frequently dwelt upon in that connection.

Thus we see that in a freer age (354–386 A.D.) when early Christianity was at its zenith, this intelligible view was held by the most exalted Church authorities.

These men of the Church sometimes alluded to the "far away begotten" whom they rightly imagined to be existing in regions then unknown (to the civilized world).

In 1655, after Red Men had been found in isolated

America, Peyrere, as we have seen, again revived the old belief which had been lost sight of during the Dark Ages. Since those early days many have advocated the sane view presented above, which is simply a return of thought to the correct reading of Genesis I. When we believe that God created the earth and mankind for the earth our vision is broadened.

Now we contend that this doctrine requires no proof; there is no ground for controversy. We do not admit the necessity of any profane evidence on the matter, for in this case especially, Scripture is explicit; but it is permissible to note that the early Fathers definitely agree with our stand as to what is the true teaching of Holy Writ.

The marvelous narrative before us plainly tells us of simultaneous creations of men and beasts in all parts of the earth. A very small part of the world was known to Moses, but the Creator knew all. America was part of the earth, and it is only reasonable to believe that this continent received its quota, for the oldest forms of life are found here.

The American Indian tells us that "Gitche Manito, the Mighty" made him here in America. We can dismiss the frills wherewith he adorns the statement, and we can also smile at the childish story relayed to us by early Israelites.

Would any reader be willing to affirm that America—then known to God alone—was not included in the earth-wide distribution of animals and men? If so, then it is incumbent upon him to explain how the multifarious forms of life reached this Continent.

Somehow and sometime God created the Red Man, and it is with him that we are herein primarily concerned. As to the *method* of the Almighty One, the *time* of the Timeless One, or the *place* of One not spatially circumscribed, we admit profound ignorance. It would be a sorry state of affairs if we with our finite minds could explain or elucidate all the workings of the Infinite Creator!

Proof is abundant of the only rational explanation of the presence of man in America—that he was created or

evolved *where he was found!* Of this fact there is overwhelming evidence. There is not a grain of proof to the contrary. American man is as old as is any other. His residence here has been at least for tens of thousands of years, and there are no data to show that man has been in any other land for a lengthier period than he.

The Amerind is not of extraneous origin. He belongs here. He is part of God's great world-creation of men, secluded from the rest of mankind when Jehovah breathed into him the breath of human life and gave him a Continent as his heritage. His very existence was not known to the rest of mankind prior to 1492 A.D.!

Why should it be deemed a religious duty to believe that the African with his head covered with kinky wool, the Indian with hair resembling straight wire, and the Northman with a head of light silk, have all descended from one single pair? To believe that Jehovah is the great Father of all mankind is reasonable; but to believe that the Black races and the Nordics had the same earthly origin is not.

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin?" Revelation and science both emphatically say "No." Why, then, strive for a common origin of the Negroid and the White races? We may reasonably suppose that Africa is the Black Man's birthland; but an opaque curtain of mystery seems to hide the locale of the motherland of the Caucasian people. They emerged from the shadows of unknown centuries and countries. Where was the land that gave them birth?

The attempt to give all races identity of origin has proved futile. "The Colonel's lady and Mrs. O'Grady" may be "sisters under the skin," but the Hottentot lady and the Norwegian lady are not—though they had the same Father-God and the same Mother-earth.

In our school days we were taught that the Negro was black because he lived at the Equator, and the Caucasian white because he dwelt in less sunny climates. If such were the case, then why is not the Arctic Eskimo white? Why are Amazonian Indians not black, but of a similar bronze

shade to the Canadian Indians? Also, why should the tropical equatorial sun of Africa turn the Negro's hair into fine curly wool and the same sun change the Brazilian Indian's hair into coarse straight wire? It is not climate but blood that counts. Darwin said, "I attribute very little to the direct action of climate."

In the life of man here upon earth, the 5,000 years of recorded history take us back only to "yesterday," but the blacks were just as black and the whites just as white at the very dawn of painted art!

How those differences in mankind originated if not at creation, we do not ourselves know—nor have we ever heard of anyone who did.

The dissimilarity of the races is at least proof that the difference occurred eons ago, as we know that the fair-haired Swede and the Red Indian are many, many centuries apart. The distinction goes back to "In the beginning." It is hard to believe otherwise when we observe the utter contrasts between the various races of the earth, not only in color but also in characteristics.

The secret of the widely-different types has never been revealed. So far as our knowledge goes, no man has ever seriously endeavored to solve the enigma presented, apart from the consideration of there being different creations.

Let us close this subject by asking the reader how the command to multiply and replenish was to be carried out with only one human pair? Will you think it out? Only a small district would have received fresh inhabitants before such an unnatural race would have died out. *Two* separate and distinct pairs at the beginning *might* have furnished inhabitants, but even that would be very questionable. We saw in a former chapter what Dr. A. E. Wiggam says of the New England Pilgrims. They were of various families in 1620, but up to 1940 they had increased so little that they could all have returned to Europe in the Mayflower.

If the reader will think for a moment he will see that

one created pair of humans could not populate the earth. Apart from being unscriptural, it is also extremely illogical, as any biologist would admit.

Fiske writes: "The notion of the descent of the human race from a single pair . . . of course the idea is absurd."

The difficulty of tracing the various types to a common ancestor is insuperable. Dr. Nott writes: "To suppose that all men originated from Adam and Eve is to assume that the order of creation has been changed in the course of historical times, and we would particularly insist upon the propriety of considering Genesis as chiefly relating to, and with special reference to, the history of the Jews. A vulgar error has been sedulously impressed upon the public mind, of which it is very hard to divest it, viz., that all races of the globe set out originally from a single point in Asia. Science now knows that no foundation in fact exists for such a conclusion. It is argued, for example, that all the Mongols, all the African Negroes, all the American Indians, have been derived from one common Asiatic pair or unique source; whereas, on the other hand, there is no evidence that human beings were not sown broadcast over the face of the earth, like animals and plants. We incline to the opinion that men were created in nations, and not in a single pair."

The words of the Hebrew *Targum* are precisely to the point: "God created man brown, white and black."

Very ancient mythology, antedating Egypt, has a story:

The Great Shadow made a large mould, and out of this fresh, clean clay the White Man stepped. After it got a little dirty the Brown Man was formed, and the Spirit being called away on business for a long period, the mould became black and unclean, and out of it walked the Negro.

Bible readers who just skim the surface frequently affirm that the various races of the world stem from Noah and his wife, but that is not the teaching of Holy Writ. These *goyim* or heathens are referred to *before Noah is born*.

Long ago Professor Agassiz wrote: "We have always

maintained *diversity* of origin for the whole range of organized beings. If it be granted, as it is on all hands, that there have been many centers of creation, instead of one, what reason is there to suppose that any one race of animals has sprung from a single pair, instead of being the natural production of many pairs? If it be conceded that there were two primitive pairs of human beings, no reason can be assigned why there may not have been hundreds under these circumstances. We should not ask if we are not entitled to conclude that these races must have originated where they occur. We maintain that, like all organized beings, mankind cannot have originated in single individuals, but must have been created in that numerical harmony which is characteristic of each species. Man must have originated in *nations*, as the bees have originated in swarms. I believe that the origin of the human race is not connected in any given place, but is to be sought everywhere over the face of the earth; and that it is an idea more worthy of the power and wisdom of the Creator to assume that He gave to each zone its life! Do we not behold on every side human characteristics so completely segregated from ours, that they can be explained no other way than by supposing a direct act of creation. I can find no satisfactory explanation of the diverse phenomena that characterizes physical Man, excepting in the doctrine of an original plurality of races. There are numerous centers of creation, thus proving that the Creator has been working through myriads of years, and through successive creations."

Polygenetic creations of mammals is conceded by all. Why not polygenetic creations of men? The obvious fact of such is clearly shown in the Book of Genesis, where from the very beginning we see that the human races were divided, and that separation is emphasized all through the Jewish writings.

Polygenetic beginnings for humankind as well as for beast-kind is an eminently reasonable thought and has been much discussed. In his book *Europa* Sergi holds the idea

that the main races of men had diverse origins. Dr. Glidden writes: "If the teachings of science be true, there must have been many centers of creation instead of one center for all types of humanity." Dr. Knox truly says: "The history of the races of men must be re-written from the beginning." That is, from Genesis I.

In the words of Alexander von Humboldt: "We do not know either from history or from tradition any period of time in which the human race has not been divided." A parent-race has never been discovered. There simply *is* no "common denominator."

Dr. Mott writes: "Our species had its origin not in one, but in several creations." Lesser men smiled incredulously at Mott in his day, and clung, and still cling, to the idea of one first pair and one particular site of man's cradle, which concept is neither scriptural nor scientific, nor intelligent biologically.

Herbert Spencer reminds us that by no possibility could an Isaac Newton be born of Hottentot parents or an Aristotle come from a father and mother with fifty-degree facial angles.

The theologian of the cloister would tell us that the radiantly-beautiful Grecian nymph and the misshapen pygmy of Central Africa are both descended from one first pair; and that Socrates and the Congo savage were of one blood less than six thousand years ago. It is simply not the case.

Africa has a black, kinky-haired man; Asia a straight-haired, yellow man; and America a red, wire-haired man. Moreover, color is among the least of the contrasts—there are varied physiognomy, characteristics, and blood. The Greek scholar will note that the word "blood" is not in the original text of Acts 17: 26.

That each section of the earth's surface should show such variation of races, with such different colors, features, and characteristics as is undoubtedly the case, we believe

to be a mystery insoluble, if men descended from one single pair.

We are by no means compelled to assume that when the *whole earth* was given herbage and fowls and beasts, only one pair of humans was created for the earth. The genetic account does not warrant such a conclusion. That is only a forced interpretation, wherein the reader, for himself, adds that which is not in the text. On the contrary we distinctly read that Cain went into another land and another tribe to get a wife.

Any tenet which has a supposed religious background has an obsessive quality; it simply must be believed. Its enormous power enables it to overwhelm Reason and Science. Jewish people naturally smile at our so serious acceptance of their peculiar folk-lore, and their family tree.

Mark Twain beautifully pictures Adam at the grave of Eve, writing her epitaph thus: "Wheresoever *she* was, *there* was Eden."

No wonder the Jewish people smiled when Kipling, the Gentile, wrote of "Our father Adam," and the family tree.

But, it may be argued, Adam is held up as the first-created all through the Old Testament, and even in the New, as the representative head. The reader will note, however, that all these references are of Jews writing to Jews. That Adam's fall concerns Gentiles is because Adam was made the titular head of all mankind. If through Adam all mankind was lost, so through the second Adam, the Jewish Savior, shall all nations be redeemed.

However, this is not a theological work, nor is it addressed to those who still cling to Eden and the one-pair-creation idea. To such, all the reasoning we might adduce is not so weighty as one deeply-rooted sentiment; but it is sad to think that the sentimental belief of some should retard the onward march of the Church.

Dr. Payne Knight writes: "Religious subjects, being beyond the reach of sense or reason, are always embraced or rejected with violence or heat." We get our bearings only

when we recognize this and surrender our little petty ideas for the truth of world creations.

The time of the creation of man is not recorded. Holy Writ sets no date. When Moses wrote the words translated "In the beginning," it was all he knew. No race had ever presumed to set the *time* of man's birthday. It was reserved for the Church fathers, millenniums later, to inform us that Adam was made on October 22nd, 4004 B.C.! He "fell" at noon the next day! It is true that few persons today believe that October 22nd, 4004 B.C. was the date of man's advent on the world's stage; but if the time can be reckoned so closely as the year, it should not be hard for the credulous to go on to acceptance of the month, day, and hour. Dr. John Lightfoot, Vice-Chancellor of the University at Cambridge, England (1627), put the date one day later and gave the hour as 9 o'clock a.m.!

While we make progress mentally in many directions, so many religious concepts seem to remain static; and while there may not be many today who accept such "fixing" of the very day and hour of the creation of man, nevertheless millions still subscribe to the dictum that 4004 B.C. was the *year* of man's advent upon this planet; and that even though we know positively that great eastern civilizations were flourishing *prior to* Dr. Lightfoot's "hour of creation!"

Has Bishop Ussher and the imagined dates that he gave to the Biblical story in 1656 made more unbelievers than did Ingersoll and Tom Paine?

This then is the real story of Creation, which is naturally separate and distinct. Through the later unfortunate division of the Bible into chapter and verse the two accounts in Genesis are made to blend together. This has confused many casual readers.

EACH IN HIS OWN TONGUE

A Fire-mist and a planet
 A crystal and a cell
 A jelly-fish and a saurian
 And caves where cavemen dwell;
 Then a sense of law and beauty
 And a Face turned from the cold
 Some call it evolution
 And others call it God.

A haze on the far horizon
 An infinite tender sky
 The ripe rich tint of the cornfields
 And the wild geese sailing high
 And all over upland and lowland
 The charm of the goldenrod
 Some of us call it autumn
 And others call it God.

Like tides on a crescent seabeach
 When the moon is new and thin
 Into our hearts high yearnings
 Come welling and surging in.
 Come from the mystic ocean
 Whose rim no foot has trod
 Some of us call it longing
 And others call it God.

A picket frozen on duty
 A mother starved for her brood
 Socrates drinking the hemlock
 And Jesus on the rood
 And millions who humble and nameless
 The straight hard pathway plod
 Some call it consecration
 And others call it God.

W. H. Carruth.

CHAPTER VIII

THE JEWISH LEGENDARY CREATION STORY

“Whoever reads these writings, wherein he is equally convinced, let him go on with me: wherein he equally hesitates, let him investigate with me: Wherein he finds himself in error, let him return to me: Wherein he finds me in error, let him call me back to him.”

From *The Findings of St. Augustine*.

Since the beginning of time primitive man has speculated on how he first appeared on the earth.

All ancient nations had their own legends of a creation and their own particular conceptions of their gods. None of them deign to speak for other peoples, though admitting their existence. Each have their own racial Eden and tribal gods.

Let us also note that all of the great religions of the world are Eastern-born; hence all of these make allusion to some Eastern “nursery.”

Our savage ancestors likewise had a legendary creation-place and manner; but the gods of Valhalla are dead, and our northern “Eden” has been lost sight of. Were it not that we perpetuate the titles of the old gods in the names of the days of the week, their names also would be forgotten. As it is, “Wodin’s Day” and “Thor’s Day” mean little. Those gods perished with the Vikings.

This author has lived among the Arabs, who tell us poetically that they are “feathers dropped from Allah’s wing in Arabia.” As a poetic phantasy it is beautiful, but we do not believe it. Neither do they! The “Garden of Allah” may be in Arabia; but Jehovah made his whole creation a garden.

Aeneas the Greek says, “In the center of the sea is the white isle of Great Zeus, and our race’s cradle.” We rev-

erently place Plato and Socrates in memory's "Hall of Fame" as they adorn their birthland, wherever it was.

The Jewish creation story, antedating that of Genesis I by thousands of years, naturally and properly starts at the beginning of Jewish history. Now what shall we think of this Hebrew document? We are struck at once by the contrasts between it and the previous one. How shall we evaluate it?

"An Exposition of the Bible," written by twenty-seven Doctors of Divinity, commenting on the two accounts, reads, "The two are glaringly inconsistent in details—no ingenuity can reconcile them."

The *Jewish Encyclopedia* reads: "It is a narrative of creation from a human point of view."

The Abingdon Bible Commentary says: "The Story with all its naïve beauty is phrased by a people intellectually and spiritually immature." The creation drama of the *modus operandi* of God in creation believed by the nomadic Israelites shows their infantile mentality.

Saint Augustine wrote, "There is no way of preserving the true sense of the first three chapters of Genesis without attributing to God things unworthy of Him, and for which one must have recourse to allegory. It is entirely too puerile for consideration."

An eminent theologian says of Genesis 2, "This is not history"; but in that he is gravely mistaken. This is history. The Jewish Bible differs from all other histories in that it is a narrative of the spiritual evolution of a people who began at zero with thoughts of a man-god making mud men. It relates the mentality of their father Adam, who thought he could hide himself from his Maker behind a bush in a garden. The singular events that occurred during their childhood, their vague ideas of a private god who could be carried in a box—a god for whom Solomon built a house "for Thee to dwell in"—a god who could be confining, not only in a temple, but in a particular room of that temple; their ignorance and sins as they climbed are

not hidden, but fully recounted. By slow degrees through the centuries they evolved from ideas of a corporeal god into new spiritual truths, and as the scales fell from their eyes they finally beheld the Unseen God of Love. This forms the truest history of a race ever written, and is an absorbing study, for let us bear in mind that the government of the Jews was a theocracy.

The God of those early Jews was an anthropomorphic one. He could see, taste, and feel. He could plant a garden. He smelled a sweet savor. He performed a surgical operation on Adam. In brief, an intelligent man-being who could make what he chose but, man-like, tired of his work and needed rest. Imagine intelligent Christians of today thinking that their God needed a day of rest! An Almighty God, Who could make millions of worlds, does not get weary. Only flesh grows tired. Even the old conception of "Atlas" supporting the earth was higher, he never became weary, though he did change the burden from shoulder to shoulder! Beyond nature man cannot go, even in thought. Thus it was that in the beginning man made himself a God; in his own image made he him, out of the mirror of his own mind.

There were long, long ages before the human mind attained to anything like what we call language, and long ages before speaking was reduced to writing, and that in a now forgotten language. The story begins as it should—at the beginning, with the oral legendary folklore, myth and fable of an archaic age. It is the tradition of a people, naturally immature, with no knowledge of spiritual things, and possessing no language to express them who made themselves a God, who later made them. It is the remarkable history of a race who evolved from groping after a primal private God into glorious heights of spiritual truths no other nation ever attained, and is a wonderful ethnological study. The scenes and events are such as an ancient people could at that time comprehend. We must remember the poorness of the mental quality and the poverty of ideas

within which they thought. The Jack and Jill story is always anterior to the abstract ideas of manhood in an individual or nation. Rev. S. C. Malan, D.D., of England, writes: "This is the most ancient story of the world. It is a version of a myth or fable handed down from generation to generation through the incoherent unrecorded ages of man when the human mind roamed in the realms of mythology, and imagined a visible God and an equally visible devil."

The entire history of the early Jewish people shows them and the surrounding nations to have been pretty much alike in their conceptions of God. While the Jews had superior enlightenment, as their prophets and teachers were divinely inspired above all others, nevertheless they had very infantile thoughts.

In this recital we see a man-god coming down to a localized place and making, not creating, a man out of dust or mud. "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground." Like all ancient nations, their God was full of curious human qualities and weaknesses. As H. G. Wells says:

"After all, pure Spirit was unknowable, a thing to be sensed and divined only; nor could it express itself in terms of itself. Jehovah was anthropomorphic because he could address himself to the Jews in terms of their understanding; so he was conceived as in their own image, as a cloud, a pillar of fire, a tangible, physical something which the mind of the Israelites could grasp." We must remember the pooriness of the mental quality and the extreme poverty of the ideas within which they thought.

Since language springs entirely from material, spatial things, there is always an element of metaphor in theological statements.

To the rude and unlettered spiritual things cannot be represented at all except by analogies drawn from things that are seen and tangible.

Adam and Eve, and in their sequence their children and

their descendants, are the subjects of this narrative. They were the remotest progenitors to whom the Israelites traced their lineage.

In the Hebrew Scriptures the word Adam never assumes any change to mark the dual or plural numbers; therefore Adam is used sometimes as a personal name, and at others he represents the tribe or clan, as we would say Adamites. This of course includes women, so Eve is called in Genesis "the mother of all living," before her own children are born.

Let us clearly understand at the outset that: "This is the book of the generations of Adam." Gen. 5.

Their childish human minds could not conceive of their semi-human God making man out of nothing, by his own Fiat, so as they used clay to make their vessels, their God used the same lowly substance to make Adam. Note also that the word *formed* or *made* is used. The Hebrews had as yet not risen to the spiritual height of understanding the term *created*, which is used in the first statement. They had also the same strange notion that the Egyptians had—that woman could not be made from the same material as man, so the Jewish God made Eve out of bone—overlooking the fact that taking a rib from Adam meant his being lopsided. Is man short of one rib? It is significant that we can plainly see, even to this day many Egyptian pictures cut in stone showing gods making men out of lumps of clay. Such One God people as the Hebrews must have been shocked to observe those same pictures showing various gods making Egyptian men.

In the eleventh century the Jewish people themselves renounced the crude creation story which they had outlived, and adopted "The Confession of Faith" which reads: "I believe with a perfect faith that the Creator is incorporeal; that he is not to be comprehended by those faculties which comprehend corporeal objects; and that there is no resemblance to him whatever."

Those of us who have had dealing with backward na-

tives of dark lands have seen grown men *making their own gods*, and possessed of the crudest of ideas.

Dr. Winchell tells us that Genesis, after the first chapter, is a history, not of the first men, but of the first Jews. This fact should be the centre of our thinking. The story does not make sense otherwise. The Jewish creation family tree remained through all the ages strictly their own exclusive lore and no other nation adopted it.

The Jews have always considered themselves a race apart, God's chosen people, all the rest of whatever color being "heathen." They were the ones favored by the Creator. Their Maker not only lavished all His love upon them, but they also claimed to have had a different genesis in a special paradise.

The Israelites not only localize their creation, but individualize their descent, thus from the beginning emphasizing their claim to be a "peculiar people," especially God-created. In a word, the Jewish people thus early regarded themselves as a special creation of a private God, in a special Eden.

The "Fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man" was a notion utterly foreign to their minds.

That the Hebrews had a more divine creation than every other race of people, is, of course, only Jewish pride of race, though there are many who claim that Jews are the only members of the second creation.

As we stated at the beginning of the chapter, this is a marvelous story, true to human life. Here we have the portrayal of a representative man and woman who both fell into sin, while of their two sons one is murdered by the other, who then becomes a vagabond. A poor start indeed! This is the family story of the Adamites, who were the most select of all the people on the earth. There were other mortals in that early world, but all we know of them are their names: sons of God, daughters of men, and giants.

The Schofield Reference Bible, published by eight of the most noted theologians of today, and regarded by tens of

thousands of church-goers as the most helpful ever published, in its *Notes* tells us that there were two separate and distinct creations. They hold that the first creative act refers to the dateless past and gives scope to all the geologic ages. This they call "the Original Creation." They hazard the suggestion that "The Sons of God" were members of that original creation.

If the Jews were right that theirs was a special creation, as they vehemently contended, the American Indian is a member of that prior universal creation. Could it be that the Amerind is the great, great granddaddy of Adam?

Were the Amalekites and the Canaanites, whom the Hebrews were commanded to destroy, also members of that original creation? At any rate, the Israelites in slaying them did not exterminate their own flesh and blood relatives, but Gentiles. There are also the "Giants," the "daughters of men," and the people of Nod. These Gentiles appear out of the nowhere, like Friday on Crusoe's island, and play their part in this no longer virgin world.

The Hebrews were the most exclusive of all the people of the earth and in their private story Gentiles are only mentioned when necessary. Their private God had made them, but had nothing to do with the goyim or Gentiles. The Hebrews believed in one God, but also thought there were other lesser gods, and that these were responsible for the making of the goyim. As time went on that truth lost its sharpness—hence the command: "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." This, then, is not the story of "The great Gentile river, but the little rill of Israel," as Schofield's Bible puts it.

If Adam and Eve were the progenitors of the whole human race the great, great grandparents of Jesus were Gentiles. That would be the inevitable conclusion, and would contradict a thousand references to the contrary. See Moses standing before Pharaoh saying, "The Lord God of the Hebrews says, 'Let *my* people go.'" All this

separation talk of theirs would be meaningless if there were no others to be separate from.

This apartness runs like a scarlet cord through all Jewish history. The Hebrew is distinct. He may be no worse or no better than the Gentile, but he has been separate from the beginning. Unless we recognize this fact the whole meaning of the recital is lost.

The idea of one created pair for all mankind, from being a crude belief of the early Christians who subscribed to the Jewish creation story, has become fixed in our thinking; and as antiquity frequently tends to confer sanctity, it has developed into a religious tenet with us. Even the infamous Simon Legree, whose slaves were to him no more than so many cattle, was taught to believe that sometime and somehow those "niggers" and he himself had had a common origin.

Yet this deep-seated error is almost universal. For hundreds of years minds have been enthralled and dominated by this un-Scriptural conception. The reader may disclaim this and cry "Heretic!" but it is so written. Man has built, not upon the Scriptures, but upon traditionary or received interpretations of them.

No one believes that God created one pair of each animal. Why should anyone imagine that in the case of man the procedure was varied when it is not so stated? We are nowhere told Adam and Eve were an only pair created. In this strictly Jewish creation story the Gentiles very naturally have no part.

Strange that while the existence is admitted of four distinct races, one human pair should be supposed to have given birth to them all.

Did it ever occur to the reader to think that if there was one first pair—an Adam and an Eve—they were either colored or white? If black, how came the Saxon offspring; and if white, how did the Negro come into being?

The first direct mention we have that alien enemies inhabited the Jewish Hesperides is that surpassingly strange

reference to a creature, described as a serpent, and by Paul as an angel of light (strange contrast of descriptions), who appeared in the Garden and subtly and persuasively spoke in human language to Eve. We are not told what the tempter was. It is left for us to guess.

The second introduction of other beings into the picture are the cherubim who guarded the tree of life with flaming sword after the Adams were turned out of the restricted area of Eden to a meaner locality. The "flaming sword" is naturally highly imaginative.

If God is the only Eternal One, the "living creatures" just referred to must have been of His creation. This thought has not received the attention it deserves. In this we clearly see that celestial creatures were created prior to man. Moreover, if there was only one origination, and that in Asia, then we would be forced to conclude that Michael the Archangel and the angel Gabriel are "Asians" along with the rest of the "Heavenly Hosts!" Likewise Satan himself! That is inescapable.

The third introduction of aliens into the Jewish picture is when the first-born son of those parents murders a younger brother. For that deed he receives a mark on his forehead, and as a penalty for his crime is driven from the presence of the Lord. We then read of his fear lest "every one that findeth me shall slay me." Who were those potential slayers? The other members of the tribe where God dwelt—the Adamites? Cain knew that over the horizon—in the "Land of Nod"—was a world of other people.

It would be difficult to find language plainer than we have here, attesting the fact of the existence of other human beings, along with Adam and Eve and their son. So Cain journeyed to the Land of Nod, where he believed God's presence was not, and took a wife—of the goyim—who clearly was living in the vicinity of the Jewish people.

The Hebrew word goyim, which we translate Gentile, had a meaning much nearer dog than Gentile, hence all mention of them or allusion to them in this exclusively Jewish

history is avoided. To the bigoted Hebrews they were not worthy of notice. When Cain said "My punishment is greater than I can bear," he meant his exclusion from the royal tribe, to live among "dogs."

It has been held by many that Cain married an unmentioned sister. What! Would you lay the blame for your ignorance on God? We blush at the intelligence of some solvers of the riddle (which indeed is no riddle at all). Moreover, what would an imagined sister be doing in an unoccupied land all alone? And why was she also away from the presence of the Lord? Such an hypothesis manifestly falls when we read further on that he "builded a city." Cain's wife must manifestly have been a woman of another race—a numerous one. How could one man, with only a wife and baby, build a city?

This third entry of foreigners onto this ancient stage is distinctly disquieting to those who have misread Genesis I, and implicitly believe in a one-pair first family, for here we have not a talking snake, or some heavenly creatures called cherubim, who might presumably have been created prior to man, but there step onto the boards real mortals like Adam and Eve and their two sons.

Now, what are we to understand by the advent of these interlopers into the picture? Who were they? These are not, as some think, cryptic references to some extra-mundane creatures; as the tempter of Eden may have been; they are real human beings. These people did not just grow, like Topsy, but were created as we read in Genesis I.

There will be those who at this point will cry "Heresy!" and who will prefer to retain the conceptions of their childhood. That is expected. Some never grow up.

The old translators of the King James version of the Bible back in 1611 wrote as follows: "Zeal to promote the common good, whether it be by devising anything ourselves, or revising that which hath been labored by others, deserveth much respect and esteem, but yet findeth but cold entertainment in the world. It is welcomed with suspicion in-

stead of love. . . . It is sure to be misconstrued, and in danger to be condemned. . . . For he that meddleth with men's religion in any part, meddleth with the custome, nay, with their freehold; and *though they find no content in that which they have, yet they cannot abide to heare of altering.*" The italics are ours.

God is all-wise. His religion must be intelligible to His creatures. Ancient notions which are without foundation in fact must be discarded.

We who have adopted the Jewish Scriptures have imbibed from them many crude and infantile conceptions of Jehovah, but it is pathetic that after the Hebrews themselves repudiated what was originally their own story 900 years ago, it should still be the conception of the Creator in the minds of millions today. Undeveloped minds seem to require some physical object to represent the invisible object of their adoration.

What could be more puerile than for us to visualize a corporeal god coming down, and using his hands to make a mud man in some localized spot in Anterior Asia? The inconsistency of thought is amazing. Let us be most emphatic in stating that God has not changed. We have.

What could be more sublime than the conception of Jehovah creating the worlds by "willing" them into being? He did not have to *come down* to some one localized spot. For us, after 2,000 years of revelation, to accept it as the literal truth is to class ourselves with the early Jews.

The Hebraic account of their creation is intensely and intentionally, and conspicuously Jewish. If Genesis II is not to be regarded as in a peculiar sense a built-up narrative of the initial start of the Jews only, *then we Gentiles are also of the stock of Abraham and David and Jesus. If we trace our descent back to their Adam and Eve, that is obvious.* Unless we admit a distinction between them and Gentiles from the beginning, all the claims of the Hebrew scriptures as to their apartness would be vain boasting. If

they were originally of Gentile blood, like the rest of mankind, where would be the distinction?

The Adam and Eve of the story were plainly not the only created ones, according to these passages of the Book, so we have more Scriptural warrant for our statements as to world creations.

Many have been the futile attempts to explain away these references. It is amusing, yet pathetic, to read whole pages of Commentaries devoted to this quest. Books have been written defending the Bible which, if read intelligently, needs no defense. By no method can we interpret the presence of these outlanders than by admitting the plain explanation of Genesis I. There is no alternative. Those references to other peoples in that primeval world are in perfect order, though the history is not of them or about them. The account is only of a family tree in which they intrude, but with whom it is not concerned. Those aliens have no part in purely Jewish history; but their presence affords all the proof needed by the cautious ones who hesitate to accept a new truth into their minds.

This is no strange heresy. As we have noted it was so believed by the Church Fathers and by many exalted churchmen ever since, and would have been an accepted truth to-day if the Book of Pereira had not been burned and lost.

The whole story of the Bible is written for a specific purpose. That purpose is to emphasize the fact that they, the Jews, were distinct. They were not related to the rest of men. They were the Royal Family of mankind, the special protégés of Jehovah, the Chosen People. From the first dawns of their singular history they have maintained this separate identity as no other nation ever did; resenting all claims to Gentile relationship. All the context shows that this is purely a Jewish home story. The existence of, and the affairs of, other races are only incidental. The analyst does not deem it necessary even to affirm the existence of alien people. It concerned them and their history

only. "The little rill, and the great river of the Gentiles, flowed in separate channels."

Woven in and out of the fabric of this recital in Genesis II, we find references to other humans inhabiting that early world. Why that should be a surprise to so many is hard to understand by the careful reader of Genesis I, who has had these *goyim* in mind all the time. It is usual to slide over such allusions and center the thoughts on Adam and Eve as the only mortals. It was utterly alien to the Jewish mind to even imagine that their private god had any interest in other nations.

Those early Jews were a part, but only a part, of the great God-created human family of world distribution. Both Scripture and profane history affirm it. Believe it or not, you cannot explain it away by any sophistry. The believer in Scripture should not try.

"Why boast of your time and place and race?

Why deem that your little spawning sod

Is the special care of a private God?"

"We are forced to the conclusion that the Old-World origin of a first human pair is no more than a time-honored tradition."

As early as Genesis VI we read of three other races besides Jews. Gentiles are referred to by name, while Adam and Eve are yet living. The very fact of Gentiles' being introduced along with Adam and Eve is not only incontrovertible evidence of the existence of these extraneous people, but it also emphasizes the fact that from the beginning they had been disturbing factors in the life of the Chosen People.

Popularly the Jews have been reckoned to be the only human beings created; but as we read the story we find, dwelling along with them, other supposedly nonexistent people.

Are we not told plainly in the chapters ensuing that there were at least three distinct races or tribes in that same re-

gion—namely, the “sons of God,” the “daughters of men,” and “giants?” The “daughters of men” whom the “sons of God” married were earthly creatures. Thus we have evidence as to the existence of other different peoples.

Here those who implicitly believe in a one-pair first family must pause and wonder. They are profoundly perplexed until they realize that they have instinctively been reading into the text what the writer never implied and never meant. So there is here in this vista, thus early, an accumulation of evidence attesting the truth of our stand that the Adamic race was not the stem but a branch of the human family, a golden bough of the human tree.

Why should theologians be unwilling to accept God's method of populating His world by creating more than one solitary pair? Why cling to an idea which was not the Creator's idea? Why seek to weave into the story an old cherished notion, now outgrown, of mistaken origin, thus doing violence to the truth? Emotions are not thoughts. When we catch up with God's way we see straight, for none can get beyond the wisdom of the All-Wise.

Somewhere about the center of that trinity of continents made up of Europe, Asia, and Africa—which we call the “Old World”—is the Holy Land. The term “Holy Land” means, of course, the country where Christ was born and where He lived and died. This term, however, conveys to many the additional idea that it was the birthplace of man—the Creation center. Tradition, legend, dream, and religious story have invested that focal point with importance as the place of beginnings—the Garden of Eden. From this fabled center of creation all nations are said to have wandered west into Europe, south into Africa, and east into Mongolia, finally reaching the eastern sea and overlapping into America. Was that Mesopotamia, over which the British flag now waves, the starting-point of the whole human race? Does a correct interpretation of Holy Writ warrant such a strange conclusion? Does it? Let us look into the subject. The concept is foolish, as are all doctrines

which go contrary to the Inspired Word. There is no fact upon which to base the supposition that the human motherland was in any part of Asia. Nothing has ever been found to prove or even to suggest that the "dispersal center" (as one imaginative writer puts it) was in Asia, for there is no plausible reason for supposing that Asia was inhabited prior to America, or any other part of the earth.

The Deity in Whom we believe did not confine His powers to Armenia. Ours is not an Asiatic God. He has now become to us the universal Father of all mankind. A local center of creation, one particular spot where Jehovah showed His creative power, is inconceivable to those who recognize His omnipresence. Jehovah is not a geographically circumscribed God. The Jewish Eden is not our Eden. The Bible does not state that it is; but the notion is widespread. The tenacity with which the idea is held only shows the strength of first impressions and transmitted habits of thought. The falsity of this long-accepted idea is plainly shown, as we have noted, by even a cursory reading of Genesis I which makes no mention of any geographical spot or the creation of one pair of human progenitors.

Shall Christians of the 20th Century be taught what the Hebrews believed 5,000 years ago? Because thousands of Hebrew children for many ages were reared on this story is no reason why Gentile children should be taught the same.

Paul says that when he was a child he thought and spoke as a child, but when a man he put away childish things, or, as he calls them, weak and beggarly elements.

As this story was conceived by Hebrews, it was natural that they should place the locale of their creation, by their own local Creator, as having been in their own land, as the Greeks do in their islands.

We are told that the god Hercules raised up his pillars at the end of the world; but men today laugh at the bounds he set. The Atlas mountains were not the end of the world.

The early Hebrew notion of the territory of their God

was as circumscribed. The center of the world at that time was the Near East. Naturally it was presumed to be Jehovah's footstool, the particular area of the earth where "He walked in the cool of the day." According to their cosmogony, creation took place there, so the writer of Genesis II, though with very meager geographical knowledge, locates his Eden somewhere in that region, so that is the setting of the stage.

For centuries the identical plot of ground was supposed to be known, and there were those who imagined they could trace the old Garden Walls. Less credulous days followed, and Eden was looked for anywhere in Asia. Then the hunting ground was extended to any part of the Old World.

There never has been uniformity of belief regarding the site of the Jewish Eden. Theologians in all ages have differed in their views and there has been worlds of latitude.

Now, it is not improbable that the Jewish race originated in West Asia. We are perfectly willing to concede to them the right to choose that area of the earth as the land of their nativity. That is why Fiske writes that "Armenia retains its interest to some extent as a possible starting-point, but only in connection with the Semitic race and its neighbors."

If we admit an Adamic center of creation, why not admit other centers of human origin?

It may be a new thought to many, but nowhere does the Bible tell us that God "came down" to Asia Minor to do His work or that He planted His garden there. Somehow that has always been taken for granted, and Christians everywhere have accepted the belief implied in the Jewish cosmogony, just as relayed to us in the Scriptures. The fact that Jesus came by the gateway of the Jewish race has to many endeared and made sacred even Hebrew legends.

The spiritual believer cannot entertain the thought of an earthly workshop for a Spirit God. There can be no local terrestrial Eden; Holy Writ gives mankind a world-circulation at the creation.

The Deity is changeless and timeless and spaceless. Time and space are merely modes of human thought. The intelligent mind cannot limit an Infinite Creator to some certain place or human method of man-making. The tradition has continued, however, though a fuller revelation has shown us (and the Jews) that the *earth* is the Lord's. When western pagan nations embraced Christianity, they were no more able to imagine a Spirit God than the early Hebrews had been. They renounced their old corporeal gods and mythical creation centers, and adopted the man-god of the Jews along with their creation Eden; thus the Hebrew Scriptures became the inspired Word for the Gentiles also. It is not surprising, therefore, that among the millions of Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans the idea of an Asian creation should cling. All are influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by the Hebrew story. The common view held has been that the one supplemented the other.

Because the Jehovah of the Jews has become also the God of the Gentile, the Jews do not ask us, in accepting the Hebrew Elohim as Creator, to accept also their own peculiar folk-lore and their creation-center.

What was natural to their minds is absurd to ours today. Are we justified today in thus limiting God to the measure of their understanding?

Since non-Jews adopted the Hebrew Scriptures as theirs, this account has been almost universally, but very erroneously, accepted as a detailed narrative of Genesis I. Such a view is not consistent with Scripture as it is not consonant with reason. Holy Writ cannot be held responsible for such a widespread but un-Biblical delusion. There is no fault with the Word. The fault is in the careless reading of it.

Payne Knight rightly says: "The error arises from mistaking the local traditions of a circumscribed community for universal history."

The Deluge also is strictly Jewish. "All the world" means all *their* world. The Hebrews who were saved were

the faithful ones, along with their local livestock, cattle, horses, sheep, camels, and the children's pet doves. We refuse to believe that Noah or any of his sons voyaged to Australia to secure kangaroos; to northern Europe to find aurochs, to China for pandas, or to America to capture llamas to convey to the Ark.

There is very much in the Scriptures that is metaphorical. God is not the "Lion of Judah." Christ is not literally the "Lamb of God." The morning stars did not "sing." The trees of the field did not "clap their hands" literally. The Jewish people are not, and never were "as numerous as the sands of the sea."

Origen and St. Augustine, Christian Fathers of the Church, wrote that "the Noachian Deluge was probably not co-extensive with the earth's surface." But we have no need to bring in any Gentile testimony, for the Hebrews themselves wrangled for ages which mountain was not covered by the Deluge—the Jews holding it to be Mount Ararat, and the Samaritans stoutly maintaining that it was Mount Gerigim, while both quoted Ezekiel 22: 24.

One Fundamentalist writer labors to tell why so many animals became extinct. It was through Noah's flood. Then, we enquire, "Why did not the Patriarch gather *all* "of every living thing," according to God's' command? They were all either clean or unclean, all God-created creatures. Moreover, "every living thing" cannot have included the multitudinous denizens of the seas.

The "two and two" of the Ark built by Noah to preserve life in that locality does not exclude there being "two and twos" of other creatures in other climes, during and after the Deluge.

If the ecclesiastic is ready to admit that the animals drowned by the Deluge were only those native to the Near East, that admission would naturally exclude American fauna and would also leave undrowned the Red Man who lived coëvally with them. Somehow *homo Americanus*

must have survived the Deluge! To be plain, on a globular earth a universal flood would be physically impossible.

That the separating of Jews and Gentiles occurred after the descent from the Ark, as so many teach cannot be entertained. The frivolity of this is apparent.

To believe that Noah's wife gave birth to White Japheth, Yellow Shem, and Black Ham is as ridiculous as it is obscene. Moreover, the tenth chapter of Genesis leads to the idea that the sons of Japheth were given lordship over the *isles of the Gentiles*, the sons of Ham other inhabited regions, and to Shem still other nations. How could they be given lordship over Gentiles unless such people existed?

Others believe that the changing of nationalities and languages occurred at the Tower of Babel. Again that is not according to Scripture. Long before either the Ark or Babel are mentioned, non-Jews are referred to. That fact is so clearly implied, and then so definitely stated in Holy Writ that we have no choice or right to think differently. Scripture and ethnology are not in conflict, God being the Author of both. If the Flood destroyed all Gentiles, then we are descendants of Noah.

Assuredly the separation of mankind into Jew and Gentile did not commence at the call of Abraham some fifteen hundred years after the Biblical date of Adam and Eve, as so many teach. It dates back to the beginning. In that Josephus concurs. Four hundred and thirty-three years before Abraham was called to head a new dispensation, there already was a division according to Biblical chronology and teaching. That Patriarch, though dwelling in Ur, and frequently called a Chaldean, was yet a member of the "chosen race." His descent is traced back to Adam. He is described as the "father of the faithful," because, while so many of God's people had proved unworthy, he remained steadfast. For this Abraham was chosen to make yet another beginning. Abraham, like Joseph, Queen Esther, the three Hebrew children, Daniel, Job and undoubtedly many others, had migrated to other spheres, as they have

done ever since. All these worthies were yet of the Adam creation and heirs of the blessings.

Why then strive for a common origin of the colored and the white races? We may reasonably suppose that Africa is the negro's birthland, but an opaque curtain of mystery seems to hide the locale of the motherland of the Caucasian people. They emerged from the shadows of unknown centuries and countries. Where was the land that gave them birth? They were just as undiscovered to the early Asian races as the Amerinds were before 1492.

The attempt to give all nations an identity of origin has proved futile. The Hottentot lady and the Swedish lady are not sisters, though they had the same Father-God and the same Mother-Earth.

At this point our evolution friend says: "Well you think you have proved your argument, and I have to admit you are right to all who believe in a creation, but there are many scientists who do not believe in a creation either local or universal. We hold that man is a product of evolution—that he descended from lower forms of life passing through the ape into sentient manhood. Seeing that the ape is not native to the western world man could not evolve here, therefore all your specious arguments fall on deaf ears. We still insist that somehow and from some part of the Old World man just had to come."

Well, my friend, let us look into your theory.

OUTLINE OF EVOLUTION

The first amoeba, as the one and only
Existing animal, was sad and lonely;
He split himself in two amoeban pieces,
Preparing for the Origin of Species.

Their brats were foraminifers and corals;
Then polyzoans, quaint, though lacking morals,
And forms of life now used as toothsome dishes,
Like gastropods, lamellibranchs and fishes.

These throve and multiplied beneath the waters;
But their more enterprising sons and daughters,
Discarding gills and all aquatic trammels,
Emerged as insects, reptiles, birds and mammals.

From reptiles grew tremendous dinosauri,
Though huge, deficient in the upper story;
From these the mammals came, some way or other
With Man, or Homo Sapiens, our brother.

This upstart, Man, once Nature's Lilliputian,
Esteems himself the Crown of Evolution;
But he will sink beneath Creation's mire
Unless he evolutes a whole lot higher.

Arthur Guiterman.

CHAPTER IX

EVOLUTION AND THE "COLOR SCHEME"

"I would rather have a new idea, even if it is given to me by somebody else, than a diamond wrist-watch, any day."

Susan Ertz in "The Golden Book."

But, the evolutionist says, "We don't give much credence to the Biblical account of creation whether local or universal. We believe that man ascended from lower forms of life and through eons of time, and finally evolved from ape to man as the climax. We are ready to admit that America may be the most ancient land on the Globe. We have also learned that all forms of life evolved in the western hemisphere. We teach that Patagonia was the place where every species of animal life originated, and that this fills up a gap of 50 million years in evolution; but America never produced an ape. As man descended from that simian he must therefore have evolved in some land where apes exist. All the references as to ancient man in America may be perfectly true. But even though it were proved that the Red Man had lived in the western hemisphere for a million years that would not make him aboriginal. He still had to come from the old world in the beginning."

This author wrote to perhaps the most prominent ethnologist in America asking the chief reason why the American Indian should not be regarded as a real autochthone, and the response was: "The Red Man could not have evolved on this continent because no anthropoid apes are found here, and they are generally regarded as man's first cousins."

How strangely different men's minds work. The fact

that there *are* apes in the old world, and that there are none in the new, would convey to our mind exactly the opposite meaning. If there are apes still existing as apes, is it not proof that they do not change? That there are no apes in America would be to us evidence that none are necessary in the human family tree.

That ape and man were found together in the Eastern Hemisphere shows to us that the one did not evolve into the other, just as it proves the same today, seeing that both existed together then, as they do today. If this writer believed in evolution from ape to man, his pet argument would be that the American apes were so full of vitality that they hurried to the metamorphosis and thus became extinct as apes, while the Old World apes were duller, and therefore large number of them remained as apes; hence they and men still live together in the Old World and have disappeared here.

Let us look into this amazing ape to man theory, and see if the relationship between the two can be proved by a noted scientist and writer.

We may also learn why man is so variously colored.

At this point we propose to lift bodily, in their proper sequence, entire sentences from H. G. Wells' *Outline of History* which seems to be the simplest and most widely-read of all the modern books on the subject of evolution. He does not seem to believe in any one Eden or one pair, but rather that different varieties of men appeared in various parts of the world.

First, then, we are told that "for millions of years this earth was without human inhabitants." That "some 550,000 years ago there appeared a different creature—a walking ape, who scattered eoliths here and there"; that this strange new animal "lived along with the now extinct monsters of early Pliocene times." Then he says "What became of them we do not know—they disappeared." "For a quarter of a million years the earth shows nothing."

"From two hundred and fifty thousand to two hundred

thousand years later there appeared another kind of 'part-human,' to whom has been given the name of 'Heidelberg man.' "

Please note that these are "absolutely distinct beings": "they were much larger": they "made better implements": and they were "quite in advance of the walking ape"—to which they were in no way related. However, the Heidelberg man goes into oblivion "leaving only a few fossil vestiges" now regarded only as "illuminating clues."

Here, then, we have brought before us several trials of evolution at man-making. We are informed most distinctly that they were separate attempts, and not just steps. One race did not merge into the other; there was no further upward growth, no evolution higher. Each one lived and became extinct before another type made its appearance. Strangely enough, however, we notice that each succeeding race was higher and more man-like than its predecessor. Yet it is averred again and again that one type disappeared altogether, and hundreds of thousands of years passed before evolution made another trial, producing a more human-like specimen each time. Still we are told of this one and that one that it was not "in the line of human descent."

We are profoundly puzzled. Evolution could, and did, produce these types, but one did not evolve into the other. Each in its turn disappeared. They were not our "poor relations"—nor even very distant relatives; in fact, were not "in the line of descent" at all.

All of the above quotations were lifted bodily from a book purporting to enlighten us regarding our descent. They are not the speculations of uninformed thought. They are statements positively made by an authority.

After Wells gives us the picture of those "Frankenstein" monstrosities of 550,000 years ago, and gives us to understand plainly that evolution had tried and failed, and tried again, and yet again to make a man, that it finally gave up experimenting, for "they all disappeared."

Wells does not claim that they had any part in our an-

cestry. "They all died." We could well imagine God creating man, not *from* the brute, but from His conception of what man could be and should be.

We might believe that, after God had breathed life, and left nature to work it out, she spawned the stegosaurus, the hideous pterodactyl, and other nightmare creatures of evolution; and that after eons of evolution the blind force of nature evolved the soulless monstrosity of the brute ape man, and that nature itself removed them. It is undeniable that those monster animals of early ages died out, along with the Quasi Men. Surely there are none who would argue that these were God-created.

But very obviously this is not evolution from lower orders up to man—as the term is usually—in this connection—understood.

Still another one hundred thousand years roll by, and what is now known as the "Piltdown man" appears. He is found in England. Science does not associate him in any way with the Heidelberg man. "There is no link whatever connecting them."

This "dawn man" seems to be a higher type than any of the other attempts, though Dr. Keith in "The Antiquity of man" says he does not think he is a creature "in the direct ancestry of man," but is far less human in character than the "*homo Heidelbergiensis*."

Now, although there is no link indicating a chain, there does seem to be here a beginning of evolution. "Better and still better human tools are found."

Then the Neanderthal man is seen. But (and here we are again perplexed) Wells says "He was certainly not descended from the 'Dawn man,' much less is it an intermediate form," but "these two types exist and probably dwell together in the same world." Also Professor Osborne writes: "During the same period there were two entirely different types of man, one of an extremely-ancient lower order." "They did not interbreed." "They became extinct." "We somehow lose both these races together."

We read, and read again. We grope, but are unable to discern the meaning of the recital. Is this an evolutionist explaining the descent of man? What he offers us is a chain without links, if all of these "sub-men" died in turn without leaving any offspring. There are lengthy chronological gaps of almost "astronomical" figures. However, expecting that the inferior always precedes the superior, and the imperfect the more perfect, we begin to think as we read "Now we shall get a picture of some far-distant relative"—only to read in the next line: "They all disappeared"; for reasons known only to nature. None educe into men. We thought evolution was a scientific development of type.

Do you grasp the significance of all that is involved in these positive statements? Freaks, freaks and still more freaks, all evolutionary attempts without any "succession," as they were "not in the line of human descent." If all died out without passing on the torch to others, how was started the next beginning of men, if, in the interim, "nothing is found"—implying that there were no shoots and branches?

Where is the continuum?

What are we to understand if those lengthy gaps are not filled in somehow? Where are the half-way intermediate creatures? The significance of this omission is apparent.

If evolutionists know sufficient, from the scanty traces that have been left, to be sure of their ground in assuming that all of those early men "ceased to exist," that they "did not change," and that they "did not interbreed," can there be (as some writer puts it) "such a frightful degree of certainty about evolution from ape to man?"

We fail to see any sequence or continuity in the story of this evolution of man. If there is none, why are these reconstructed skulls manufactured and placed in a row in our museums, and captioned "Ape to Man?" The reason escapes us.

If they are so "irrelevant," why bring them into the story at all? What are we to take hold of amid such confusion

of thought? Why are the skulls of those "misfits" placed so suggestively in one row in our Museums if they are not interrelated or interconnected? If the "dawn man" is "not in our line of descent," it concerns us little. We have enough poor relations already.

But how otherwise are we expected to account for the ascent of man from lower forms of life? We cannot accept the teaching that all of these "sub-men" died out and did not evolve into something higher—if we are to believe in evolution. Observe this closely.

At what conclusion have we arrived? There does not seem to be any necessary connection between these attempts and the advent of the real man. We could accept the claims of evolution that the lower forms of life preceded the higher. Geology and scripture agree on that. The reader will see then that we have in this recital before us the independent rise of several varieties of sub-men, as well as widely contrasting types of true men. Note that these are distinct from the start, one being a Negro type. They are contemporaneous, and not only different, but also world-wide, just as is taught in Genesis I.

These are what Prof. Loren C. Eiseley of the University of Kansas describes as "collateral relatives—human of course, but not our immediate ancestors, not the orthodox line of human ascent." Note that these are "relatives and human," so are our mothers-in-law.

How accurately in this respect does science seem to go along with the Bible; divers kinds of human beings in the early world at the same time. Science and religion are not in conflict.

Another 200,000 years roll by. Wells then abruptly introduces to us the "Cro-Magnon" men. He just informs us that they "appeared," from nowhere. Without progenitors so far as his recital goes.

Wells makes no comment upon their surprising advent, except to make it very plain that they were not in any way related to the quasi-men of whom he had been writing. On

some subjects he is almost tediously prolix, but upon this—the most stupendous phenomenon of all history, strangely enough he makes no comment. The first denouement of *man* to the world draws from him no exclamation of wonderment or interrogation! And yet there had been no real humans produced until the Cro-Magnon men came on the scene! Whence did they come? How did they come into being? If it is so absolutely certain that the above-mentioned “sub-men” were not their progenitors, how then does Mr. Wells account for their most momentous arrival! Strictly *entre-nous*, he seems to deliberately close his mind as to their source. If he knew, it was his own private secret.

So far as “The Outline” is concerned, those real men just appeared. They have no discernible past.

Taking the text as it stands, we are led to but one conclusion, namely, that somehow (by creation?) the Cro-Magnons came forth, the first real humans, a “Cro-Magnon” race, sans grandmothers or grandfathers! An initiatory beginning some 50 thousand years ago. This on his own showing.

Thus after a preamble which seems to be quite foreign to the point, we are abruptly brought face to face with real humans, God-created creatures, men and women who did not “die out,” “cease to exist,” etc. These people were our progenitors, possessed of brain power and attributes akin to our own.

Would Wells then admit (as he leaves us free to infer), that divine omnipotence alone could create *man*? Is there not here shown (and from the writings of an admitted evolutionist!) the fallacy of thinking, as do some, that even man himself was the product of “evolution” and was not God-created.

Wells tells us that “these Cro-Magnards were truly human; as intelligent or more intelligent than we are; and they agreed with modern ethnologists in regarding themselves as a different species. It would seem that the true

man would have nothing whatever to do with the Neanderthal race, women or men. There is no trace of any intercourse between the races. We know nothing of the Neanderthal man, but this absence of intermixture seems to suggest an extreme hairiness, an ugliness, or a repulsive strangeness. Or he or she may have been too fierce to tame." The dim racial remembrances of such gorilla-like monsters may be the germ of the ogre in folk-lore.

Mr. Wells here slips a cog, for he has told us some pages ago that the Neanderthal men "became extinct." How then could there be any intercourse?

The Cro-Magnon and the Neanderthal man may not have been related, as Wells says, but if they did not breed, but died out, why then do ethnologists write so often of the "basic races," and why refer to the Neanderthal types seen now along the Mediterranean so frequently?

Evolutionists almost invariably regard the Neanderthal man and the Cro-Magnon man as the oldest types of real men; those who insist that the Cradle of our race was in Asia should ponder the fact that both these types were found in Europe—not in Asia.

Wells also makes it very plain that not only were there various types of sub-men, but he also describes to us contrasting types of true men.

To continue, he writes: "We know of two distinct sorts of skeletal remains in this period, the Cro-Magnon race and the Grimaldi race." Again, "There may have been many more distinct races than these two, and again, there may have been intermediate types." He then introduces us to several distinct races which, somehow, somewhere, arose in those distant ages. Continuing, he says, "There can be no doubt that we have to deal in this period with at least *two* and probably more *highly-divergent types of true men*." "At Mentone there were discovered two skeletons of a widely-contrasted type, with negroid characteristics that point rather to the Negro type." "They may have overlapped in time, or Cro-Magnards may have followed

the Grimaldi race, or either or both may have been contemporary with the late Neanderthal man."

It is denied that they are related one to the other.

Scientific research thus shows that man appeared in various parts of the world and that there were widely contrasting types of true men. Note that these are distinct from the start, one being a *Negro* type. They are contemporaneous, and not only different, but also world wide just as is taught in Genesis I.

The Cro-Magnon men, the first? "real" humans, were specially-created beings. After all the crude attempts at man-making, the Creator stepped in and stopped the bungling of nature and did Himself form the man He desired to set His heart upon, and that then "man became a living soul," "made in His image" (or better stated, "after His pattern")?

Here, then, we have the special intervention of the Creator. This was no transmutation of species. This was the breath of God.

This climacteric debut of the sentiment men was not the result of successive evolutions. "So God created man." They were the handiwork of a Master Workman. "And God blessed them and said, 'Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth.'" They were not "scheduled" to disappear! Replenish, Webster tells us, means "to fill up after being emptied or lessened." Does this not plainly mean that after those monstrosities of animal and human life were removed, the real man was to fill up, after the freaks had disappeared?

So we contend that ape-to-man remains a personal, private belief. It is not a proven fact of science. Professor Joseph Le Conte of the University of California says: "The evidence of geology today is that species seem to come into existence suddenly and in full perfection."

Sir Charles Bell of the University of London says: "Everything declares the species to have their origin in a distinct creation, not in a gradual variation from some original type."

Professor Lionel S. Beale, in an address before the Victoria Institute of London, said, "There is no evidence that man has descended, or is, or was, in any way specially related to any other organism in nature, through evolution or by any other process. In support of all rationalistic conjectures concerning man's origin, there is not, at this time, a shadow of scientific evidence." This is both fact and religion.

Were Darwin and Huxley right in thinking that the half-animal men along with the gigantic monsters which evolution had made were thus superseded by more fitting creatures? As old races became extinct the earth became the residence of a higher order of beings.

"Natural causes" can transform an acorn into an oak; but only by human intelligence would we be likely to find the lumber of that oak tree fashioned into a Duncan Phyfe cabinet.

Is the only solution to the enigma that *at this point God created men*, not *made* them from a lower order?

Such a conception would be a sop to the claims of the evolutionists, and still leave us the soul-satisfied sense of being children of God.

Is it not suggestive that the first real man he brings before us is known as the most intelligent and biggest brained man of record? Naturally he was, a being God-created.

Chesterton says: "The alleged animal that connects man with the brutes is not an animal but an allegation." H. G. Wells in his *Outline* admits that "not a single bone of such a creature has ever been found." So, at any rate, if the "missing link" has not been found here in America, it has not been found anywhere else, and is still "missing."

With a connection, or connections, unfound, unknown, lacking, can man's supposed evolutionary ascent from the ape be accepted? There is a gap which no mind has been able to cross.

Huxley said: "There is a divergence practically infinite." The link that made man a living soul is not of earth.

The animal is a body and has a soul. Man is a soul and has a body.

If the ape, the gibbon, or the lemur, is in line of man's descent, no link has ever been found anywhere to bridge the gulf. Fiske says that the difference between man and ape transcends the difference between the ape and a blade of grass.

The expression "Life slept in matter, dreamt in the animals, waked in man" may be poetic, but has no foundation in fact. Why seek to found a belief on an unproved theory? Can such a claim be sustained? When no indication of any "missing link" has ever been found in the Gobi Desert, or anywhere westward to the Golden Horn? No informed person will deny that.

In the multiplicity of ideas, views, surmises, conjectures, theories and calculations regarding the advent of man on this earth, and his world distribution, we come back to Genesis I. That solves every problem, and is so easy for human reason to accept.

When man's relationship to the ape cannot be established, when Wells himself tells us that "no dingle bone has ever been discovered" which could belong to an intermediate creature, we conclude that the ape cannot therefore be *accused* of being man's ancestor.

In all the wide world, in all the centuries, no trace has been found of any bond connecting animal to man. That coupling was at first announced as a thought. It remained as a guess. It developed into a theory. It is now by many accepted as a certainty. But, since its first promulgation not one iota of evidence has been found to prove it. It is a chasm without a bridge. A dogma without foundation.

Where then do we stand? To us, a belief in this unbridged void entails too much credulity. We are not possessed of the necessary faith to grasp at nothing. Our imagination will not permit us to cross a bridge which does not exist. We are by nature sceptical and demand proof.

What have we learned from the *Outline*? Has Wells

proved any ape-to-man descent or ascent? Or indeed any possible relationship between the two?

When theory meets with fact contrary to the theory, then the theory is wrong, not the fact.

The believer in evolution from ape to man is naturally one who does not admit of a Creator God.

The learned ones of all ages have pondered over the problem of there being differently-tinted men and found it enshrouded in deep mystery. Men like Darwin, Huxley, Spencer, Agassiz, Von Humboldt and many others were unable to solve the riddle. The enigma of variously-colored man never has been solved.

However, we note the easy "how it all came about" of a Yale Professor. Read his own words, and with us mourn that students should have handed out to them such twaddle. Is that remark too caustic? How can one write dispassionately after reading of the "simple" way in which man's color changed—so "simple" that only the "simple" could believe it? He says: "On the way to this continent, one race took on a reddish hue, and its hair grew straight and black; another became black-skinned and crinkly-haired, while a third developed a white skin and wavy blond hair." (!)

How, or why, those changes occurred, he does not state! Perhaps he does not know; but surely his imagination could have further enlightened us! But no, the above-quoted bald statement is all he gives. The matter of *proof* does not seem to have occurred to him! What a wonderfully easy transformation—walk south and become black; journey eastward and turn lemon-colored; go west and be bleached white; hie across the Behring Straits and become red! Just as simple as that! His students now know that if perchance they wander south they'll become Negroes! They are duly warned!

Is it Dr. Fossdick who writes: "The capacity of modern man to believe is unbelievable."

However the Amerinds got their color, they have always

been referred to as "Red" men. History shows clearly, from the reports of the Spaniards who first beheld them, that they were known as "Red" Indians ("Indios rojos").

Early in the 17th century, Linnaeus writes of the "*Americus Rubescens*" as being a separate race.

In 1781 Blumenbach divided mankind into four races, namely: the Caucasian, Mongolian, African, and American.

If the American Indian is an Asian, what strange alchemy transformed him from a yellow man to a red one? Change of climate? Does the Anglo-Saxon turn black after centuries of residence in Africa? Does the Negro proceed to lose his color when brought therefrom?

Have the Mayflower descendants turned to a red color? Does the Amerind lose his pigmentation even after centuries of residence in Europe? Or was it that he acquired a permanent "blush" because his prophets envisioned the "America" of the future, with its crooked politicians, its Moviedom scandals, and its corrupt judiciary?

If sane reasoning gives to the Black Man, the White, and the Yellow Man different earthly progenitors, why then deny the different ethnic characteristics of the Red Man, which just as cogently place *him* apart from the rest? Why insist that *his* forefathers were dragon-worshipers? Why not at long last admit him to be a distinct and separate race of humanity, created here in America—his very own terrain?

What is to be gained by allocating the Amerind to Asia?

How identify and pigeon-hole the other races? Our own, for instance?

Why not just accept the fact that men, like animals, were of varied colors from the initial start.

Is not the idea eminently reasonable? Does it not show more intelligence to hold such opinion than to persist in the notion that all of the races came from one pair? Does straight thinking not lead us to the perplexing problem of the color line and suggest the rise of the various races of

men? Does that thought commend itself to the reader's intelligence? It seems to answer the age-old question.

There is not a scrap of proof to indicate whether the cavemen had black skin and kinky hair, or white skin and fair hair. What more reasonable than to postulate cavemen of Asiatic, Nordic, Colored Men and Red Men?

In "Customs of Mankind" it is stated that "there was an ancient American race coeval with the oldest cavemen in Europe."

The American cavemen, ethnologists tell us, resembled the present Indian. We may naturally conclude that the Piltdown Man was White, the Pekin Man, Yellow, and the Rhodesian, Black. So much then for the Color Scheme of the human family.

It must surely have been an awesome sight, away back in the childhood of the world, when first a black-skinned "caveman" caught sight of a white human! Did he run in terror, we wonder, as from some new species of wild animals? Of such meeting we have no record.

Many, many centuries had passed, and eastern nations had risen to great heights, and the Grecian and Roman Empires succeeded them before the fair-haired blonds of northwestern Europe emerged to awe and surprise them by their utter strangeness and dissimilarity to anything theretofore encountered. We have no date of that revealing; but the emergence of the Red Man into our ken was, of course, at the time of the discovery by Columbus.

If the various Continents have had different *animals* from the beginning why not divergent *men*? Why all men of one color?

If the Christian hesitates at the thought of God creating humans variously colored, and the evolutionist cannot see how men of several colors were evolved, let them explain why white-faced and "Nigger" monkeys exist.

Animals were created of varying hues. There are simians with faces as white as our own; others are coal-black; others bright scarlet; while still others have blue faces.

Surely there are none who would affirm that the jet black face of the Simian could evolve into the white face, or conversely the white into the black?

If creation or evolution produced a maned lion, an ostrich, and a black man in Africa, the same force or forces could produce a maneless lion, a rhea, and a Red Man in America!

All similar but distinct and unrelated.

If creation or evolution evolved different animals, why deny that it produced divergent men? They exist, we cannot ignore that fact, and there are worlds of contrast between them. Have you, reader, an intelligent explanation of the phenomenon other than the above?

If American fauna is distinct from others, why should not the African and the American man likewise be distinctive?

Whatever excuse may be offered today in behalf of the continuance of the belief that America could have no autochthonous man, there is not, and never has been, any other foundation than the original one—the ingrained belief in a dispersion of man from the Ark. Any denial of this is artless self hypnosis.

PRIMEVAL MAN

No matter what your distant origin,
Whether begot of Adam's primal sin,
Who, 'mid the poppy scent of Eden's bowers,
Loved fruit of good and evil more than flowers;
Or bred in tropic jungles, when some ape,
Ambitious, made his epochal escape;
If, cursed and scourged, from Paradise you fled
Or from the wilderness by yearnings led—
In either case you showed uncommon wit,
And—fall'n or ris'n—made the best of it.
Out of chaotic mists, out of the slime,
Out of the ruthless glacier's path to climb.
A cell, a simian, a troglodyte;
Or out of dust, created overnight
In God's own image, but to err and fall,
And yet survive and triumph over all —
Let clashing creeds debate upon the plan,
I sing your praises, O primeval Man!
Perhaps a brother to the ape, the clod,
But kinsman too of angels and of God!

Anonymous.

CHAPTER X

THE RISE OF NEW WORLD MAN

"I shall adopt new views so fast as they are shown to be true views."—*Abraham Lincoln*.

Now let us see if the advent of American man in any wise corresponds with those in the other hemisphere? H. G. Wells begins his story by introducing "a walking ape," "those unknown mysterious quasi men, who scattered eoliths here and there throughout the Old World." Let us see if we can duplicate his story in the New World.

Dr. J. Deniker in his "Races of Man" adduces evidence to show that eoliths and paleoliths have been found in America. From Peabody Museum Reports we learn that Paleolithic and Neolithic implements have been collected in large numbers in Brazil. If those eoliths heralded the advent of dawn man across the Atlantic, why not so regard it in America?

Were there Eolithic men here before there were such in the Old World? Did they appear simultaneously with each other?

The late Doctor Henry Fairfield Osborn, noted scientist, claimed that there existed in North America about the middle of the Pliocene period a high form of Anthropoid, with a leaning to the human side, to which he gave the name *Hesperopithecus*.

In the summer of 1934 a scientist found 30 well-developed primate skulls in the Beartooth Mountains, a range of the Rockies in Montana. He estimated that "these primates from which man descended lived from 156 to 175 millions of years ago. They are the closest link with the original 'Darwinian Anthropoid Ape' extant."

If evolution could or did produce "sub-men" in so many and such scattered portions of the earth, no rational thinking can exclude America as one of the evolutionary stages. Or, if God evoked man into being, America is just as near as Asia to an Omnipresent God.

Dr. James Scherer of the Southwest Museum says: "The first sure proof of a dawn man's existence on this continent has been uncovered." Dr. Charles Stock writes of finding "definite evidences of early man, carrying back human existence in America five hundred thousand years."

Professor Harrington discovered that the Amerind lived here coevally with the ground-sloth of the Pleistocene Epoch.

The Neolithic or Neanderthal men then make their appearance, and finally the Cro-Magnon man, represented by the present American.

These American dawn men, carbon copies of the Heidelbergers, are subject to the same questionings as those of the Eastern Hemisphere, and in America, as in the Old World, no tie or bond joins them to the Eolith creatures.

It is significant that while in the Eastern Hemisphere various races and colors come into being, the American continent produces only one American type and color.

Edgar lee Hewitt writes: "How life got started on it is not a matter of inquiry here. It had a vast natural history of its own—had no consciousness of any other world or any other human life. Separated by seas and skies that isolated it through the ages as completely as space divides us from Mars."

Dr. George Gaylord Simpson of the Museum of Natural History has surmised: "that in the Crazy Mountains of Montana creatures linked to man existed there millions of years ago, taking us back into the immeasurable reaches of time." Fantastic? Maybe; maybe not.

Fossil monkeys have been found in various parts of America, and a single specimen of an extinct ape was discovered near Lagoa Santa in Brazil; but maybe that is just

the odd one which we last saw riding on the elephant's back, coming across that fifty-mile embankment from Siberia? We have had great difficulty bringing apes to Chicago.

Imagine apes coming through Siberia! Or it might be the "single simian forefather" Henry Thomas tells us was the progenitor of "all of us." Brazil is vast. What lies under its forests is intriguing. One thing is certain: if there is one ape there are more there.

Read also the writings of Dr. Ameghino of Buenos Aires, which have caused quite a stir. He is "*positive* that American monkeys are closely allied to apes, and declares that man could have been evolved from them."

Nay: America can go back farther than the apes. Dr. Spinden of the Brooklyn Museum long ago writes of the half-apes of Wyoming, U. S. A., which were given the name of Taurians. Those are the creatures who make that astounding journey all around the world we write of in a later chapter.

Lewis Spence in one of his latest books says: "Had man been native to the New World there would have been found side by side with him either existing or fossil representatives of the greater apes and other anthropoid mammals which illustrate his pedigree in the Old World."

Oh, yes, Mr. Spence: there are apes found in America, and also discovered in close connection with man.

At a recent meeting of savants in Des Moines, Iowa, there was laid before the American Association for the Advancement of Science definite evidence of human existence at a date farther back in antiquity than had heretofore been dreamed of; and the claim was then made that the State of Nebraska had the oldest evidence of human kind upon this planet!

We quote from the *Scientific American*: "An expedition sent out by the Smithsonian Institute under the direction of Mr. Albert Thomson found evidences in Nebraska of the first culture known to have been developed by the human

race, and the oldest traces of humanity by hundreds of thousands of years. Dr. Osborn, President of the Museum of Natural History, is convinced that these artifacts may be from three to four million years old. It is his belief that man, as such, has existed on this earth for more than five million years."

Is there any need to look for *apes* in the Americas if *homo sapiens* himself goes back thus far!

Could it be that the "Red" evolution, and then creation, blossomed forth while the primates in the Old World were still lagging behind?

Scientists do not claim that the real man appeared in Europe prior to 50 thousand years ago; but according to recent testimony the Amerind existed here before either the Piltdown or the Heidelberg man was seen across the Atlantic!

Dr. Chester Scott of the University of California has found evidence in the Mesa Pit "that a race of thinking men, with some degree of civilization, lived and died here in America thousands of years before even the ape-man made his appearance in Europe, Asia, Java or elsewhere. The race of men to which the human remains apparently belonged dates back tens of thousands of years."

Dr. Allen LeBoron's discovery in Nevada of what he considers "one of the oldest, if not the original primitive civilization so far removed from the present that Babylon, Nineveh, and Tyre must be looked upon as events of yesterday, and the death of Tut-Ankh-Amen of such recent date as to be a case for the coroner! These people were a race with *no ape in their pedigree*, and with skulls no different from those of today; a people who used tools, though crude; artists who engraved upon the rocks they had piled up to form the hill of a Thousand Tombs." It is to say the least doubtful if their were human beings in any part of the Old World so long ago.

Dr. Robert Thomas Hill of Washington, D. C., writes of LeBoron's discovery:

"This is a tremendous find. The geological formation in which these bones were discovered apparently gives them an antiquity far greater than that of any human remains previously unearthed in Europe or elsewhere."

Scarcely a week passes without some new find being reported. We could very easily fill several chapters recounting the numbers of fossil man and very ancient remains which have been found in the last decades. Perhaps the latest is the Neolithic Man of Saskatchewan. Regarding this Dr. Ernest A. Hooten, Professor of Anthropology at Harvard, writes: "Evidence suggesting a considerable antiquity of mankind in the New World keeps cropping up, and each succeeding growth is harder to trample down. Some day, someone is going to uncover remains of ancient man in America, which everybody will have to accept. There is now, for example, what I consider to be the leading candidate for such honor—the Minnesota man—who appears to have been a young lady who fell into a lake. This discovery calls for consideration by a commission of impartial experts. It is no longer possible to discredit the geological antiquity of fossil American finds on the sole ground that they do not exhibit Neanderthaloid features. It is conceivable that we, like the cheering Romans who remained on the safe side of the Tiber, presently may be impelled to shout, "Back, Ales! Back, Hrdlicka! Back ere the ruins fall!"

Dr. Ales Hrdlicka seems now to be almost alone in affirming that the Amerind is a newcomer.

So Ice-Age-Minnie, as she is called, was rejected as very ancient because she has not Mongolian features? But how come? Hrdlicka himself tells us that "the Mongolians left Europe to populate Asia." Minnie is certainly older than the date of that migration; and the fact that her features are not Mongolian are her highest credentials to extreme age.

The temerity of some scientists, who are so opposed to independent research cling so tenaciously to bewhiskered notions, accepted theories, hallowed legends, and venerable beliefs, denying incontrovertible cold facts, have retarded research too long.

Bagehot says, "The keenest anguish known to human nature is the pain of a new idea. Any man in the public eye who is handcuffed by the vice of custom and convention is not free to act as various questions come to him from time to time. He is as one locked in a prison house, the keys to which are in the keeping of days and promulgations that are dead."

Too often startling discoveries are pooh-poohed by some of the leaders of ethnological thought, whose textbooks have been classics for so long that they are mouldy. In a summary manner, new discoveries are pronounced "recent" or "planted" or "impossible," and so are discredited or explained away, as though there was no reality beyond the opinion of the arbiter.

The younger professors, the "yes men," must perforce teach the old "shibboleths" or lose their positions.

Along with them is that army of neutrals who have long had their own ideas, but hesitate to oppose their superiors and set themselves against the old textbooks. Yes-men in political circles are not the only ones extant. The "small fry" refuse to take the initiative and shrink from stating their own ideas. Dr. Charles Stock writes of finding "definite evidences of early man, carrying back human existence in America five hundred thousand years."

Professor Harrington discovered that the Amerind lived here coevally with the ground-sloth of the Pleistocene Epoch.

Some of the old school of thought will hold that the age of American man is not so great as some of the authorities quoted in this book claim. They do not want disturbing sentiments loosed on the community.

Who was it that said, "The only difference between a rut and a grave is the depth?"

In Europe the Neolithic and Neanderthal men make their appearance, and finally comes the Cro-Magnon Man, represented by the present Amerind. It is significant that while in the Eastern Hemisphere various races and colors were produced, the American continent brought forth only one type and color.

In "The Antiquity of Man," Keith says: "Before the last glaciation, man in the form of that highly-evolved race, the American Indian, was living on the eastern seaboard of North America when the Cro-Magnon race inhabited the rock shelters of France." They were contemporary men, separated by uncharted seas east and west, and lived parallel lives.

The author wrote to the Smithsonian Institute on this subject, asking, "Is there conclusive evidence that man lived in North or South America in the Pleistocene Age?" And received the following response: "Dr. Hrdlicka says: 'There is no conclusive evidence. The only evidence of so-called early man on this continent is the association of artifacts with extinct animals. So far, the age of those extinct animals has not been fully established.'" Thus the issue was dodged, through pedantic authority.

The reply of other scientists is to the effect that if this association has been found in the Old World, the answer would have been a definite "Yes." Our correspondent had not read of Dr. Lund's discovery, it would seem.

In the province of Minas Geraes in Brazil, human skeletons, in a fossil state, were found among the remains of 44 species of extinct animals among which was a fossil horse (cohippus), and Dr. Lund, the discoverer, is certain that all of them were once contemporaneous inhabitants of that region. A single specimen of an extinct family of apes was also found among them. These facts establish not only that South America was inhabited by an ancient people, long before the discovery of the New Continent, or that

the population of this part of the world must have preceded all historical notice of their existence; they demonstrate that aboriginal man in Amercia antedates the Mississippi alluvia, because the bones are fossilized; and that he can boast of a geological antiquity, because numerous species of animals have been blotted from creation since American humanity's first appearance. The form of the crania moreover, proves that the general type of race inhabiting America at that inconceivably-remote era was the same which prevailed at the period of the Columbian discovery: and this consideration may spare science the trouble of any further speculation on the *modus* through which the New World became peopled by immigration from the Old; for after carrying backwards the existence of a surpassingly ancient people monumentally into the very night of time, when we find that they have also preserved the same type back to a remote, even to a geological period, there can be no necessity for going abroad to seek their origin." These are the oldest human remains on the oldest continent; man, fossilized man, exists therefore in America. The human fossils of Brazil and Florida carry back the aboriginal population of this Continent far beyond any necessity of hunting for American man's foreign origin through Asian immigration.

Dr. Thomas Hill of Washington, D. C., writes as follows:

"This is a tremendous find. The geological formation in which these bones were discovered apparently gives them an antiquity far greater than that of any human remains previously unearthed in Europe or elsewhere."

Gregory Mason writes: "One reason why all appreciation of the great age of the American man and the great height of his culture has been retarded is that learned but misguided persons have attempted to apply to America the method of measuring the early history of man which is applied to Europe and Asia."

In America we had the Calaveras skull. We write had,

as it is not fashionable to refer to that unfortunate individual who left his head deeply interred under the base of Table Mountain in California—the whole mountain mass having been formed *since* he lived and died! Because this gentleman was foolish enough to get himself buried in America, prejudiced thinking has ruled him out as being of an extremely early type; though doubtless if he had been discovered in the heart of a mountain in Asia, his cranial bones would have been hailed as a wonderful “find” instead of being sneered at! The Calaveras skull has induced many a wrangle, but no real reason has ever been adduced by any scholar as to why its owner should not be regarded as a “sub-man.” At the time of discovery, he was too unique to be accepted at his face value.

At that time ancient American man was impossible. Some decades later he was judged possible. Still later probable. Now many would say certain.

An answer is given to all these queries by the fact that very early human remains are found in American soil. True, they may not wholly resemble the finds in the Old World. Why should they? The camel and the llama developed differently. As pointed out by Fiske, “The primeval California skull resembles the modern Indian type, and is not to be confounded with Old World skulls.” Why should the ancient American skull be like the Old World types?

Why does Wells ignore the American man? In a late chapter of his book he simply refers to the Amerind:

“Who came from Mongolia.”

H. G. Wells writes that hoary quotation as though it were one of the eternal verities. At this point, to use the words of another, “he shifted his brain into neutral and let his pen idle on.” So much for the tyranny of phrases. Why they came, why they needed to come, how they came does not concern him. Yet this Redskin is claimed by the highest authorities as having lived here ages before Wells imaginatively brings to this soil his Mongoloids. Here, then,

we have an avowed evolutionist who yet cannot free himself from the chains of a 17th century dictum.

Wells himself points out "the likeness of the Paleolithic people of Europe and the Paleolithic Amerinds in their pictorial dispositions, their painted garments, and in their free use of paint, and in their general characteristics showing remarkable resemblance to the Later Paleolithic men of Europe."

It is admitted that Columbus found Late Paleolithic man in the West Indies; that later he was discovered inhabiting Northern Canada, Alaska and the Pacific islands; that still later he was seen in the Ainus of Japan; while the Tasmanian and the Tierra del Fuegan have been classified as Early Paleolithic. These lands are wide-scattered.

When Darwin saw the Indians of Tierra del Fuego he doubted that they were human. The savages we ourselves have encountered in Amazonia cannot be much removed from the Neanderthal men. The low state of their mental development is shown by their disregard for time; nor have they any records or traditions of the past. No religion is known among them, nor have they any fetish rites. The reader will note that New World discoveries pretty well parallel Old World discoveries. No connection of man with ape in either world found; no missing link in Old or New World.

Dr. Frank C. Hibben of the University of New Mexico some time ago reported the discovery of the Folsom Man of New Mexico which he declared to be ten thousand years old. Now that some anthropologist writes the story of finding earlier men of perhaps twenty-five thousand years ago, "which makes the Folsom Man seem like a Johnny-come-lately."

In a cave in Bishop's Cap, New Mexico, Dr. Charles Stock found human bones which he estimated to be perhaps fifty thousand years old. In the same valley, Dr. Albert Jenks, of the University of Minnesota, found evidence that

there were "highly civilized people, who possessed a remarkable culture, two thousand years before Christ."

Professors Heizer and Cook of the University of California have now, in 1947, unearthed fossilized bones in the Lower Sacramento Valley and Cook reports that they might be as old as twenty thousand years. They have given that era a new name—*The Paleo Indian Age*.

Perhaps the most responsible and highly-placed paleontologist of the world, Dr. Oliver P. Hay, tells us that "real humans lived on the American Continent even four hundred thousand years ago," "Coeval with the Heidelberg man of Europe," and "a separate species from the Neanderthal man."

Men like Dr. Hay—now departed to learn in another larger life, the mysteries he so strove to unravel in this—are surely entitled to have their utterances treated with profound respect.

It is true that there were many who could not follow him in his conclusions—lesser men lacking his training and vision. There were even some who mocked at his decisions; but large numbers now hold with Dr. Hay that the "*homo Americanus*" is just as old as any other human.

Julian Dane, writing of a remarkable find, tells us: "The graves of the first Californians were sunken mounds in the valley. Earth had dissolved most of the bones, but a dozen skulls were found hidden in alluvial deposits of great antiquity. Above them lay the skeletal remains of another race. The ground between the bones of the two races was of different geological periods, the first race preceded the second by an incredible number of years."

It is significant that the skulls recently unearthed in China were not of a lower order.

If there is no tie found in all the Old World which would connect the ape-to-man, why then be so insistent in affirming that aboriginal American man could not evolve or be created in America. Is that a reasonable stand? Intelligence

would say *prove the descent first in the Old World before applying it to America.*

We have conducted the reader on various shuttling routes the Red Man is conjectured to have made. First he was discovered in America and was called an Indian. Then he had come through Siberia and was called an emigrant from Ararat. After that he was dubbed an ex-Chinese or ex-Egyptian. When that was seen to be a silly guess, he was conjectured to be a Kamchatkan emigrant, or ex-Mongolian, or ex-East Indian, or ex-Malayan. One prominent ethnologist informed the world that he was an ex-Siberian, but forgot that he had written that Siberia was without inhabitants, so had to eat his words.

Now let us take another step in our investigations, for today there are scientists who are turning right about face, and telling us that the Amerind not only evolved here in America but that he preceded any Old World evolution.

Many are now claiming that this western world having the oldest known mammals, has also the most ancient human family, and that this was the land where man first appeared as the lord of creation—that America did not necessarily have to be peopled from some other source. Not only are they insistent on that, but they entirely reverse the direction of the migration and assert that the Amerind populated the earth—that it is just as probable that the rest of the world could have been given its population from America!

It is stated in *The People's Cyclopedia*, "The arguments brought forward in support of an Asiatic origin of the American would not lose their point if adduced in favor of an American origin of the Asiatic peoples."

If there is a road from Jerusalem to Jericho, there is likewise a road from Jericho to Jerusalem!

The *Americana* enquires: "Might there not have been an overflowing into Asia?"

It is just as reasonable (and just as improbable) to sup-

pose that the Old World was peopled from America as that the Red Man wandered here from Asia!

In this connection be it noted that the Indian has always been known to be more skilled in the management of a canoe than the Asian; and Columbus reported in the year 1502 that he had encountered a party of Mayans in a large vessel equipped with sails. When the "Santa Maria" was wrecked, it was the skillful natives who salvaged her freight. The Spaniards at once recognized the superior ability of the Caribs in managing boats through the surf; and they wisely relinquished their authority into the hands of the natives when in any danger.

Laut, the historian, tells us that here is just as much evidence pointing to America as being the birthplace of mankind as there is to Asia's being such. A few quotations will show how recent winds blow.

Writes Professor Fowler: "It is quite as likely that Asiatic man may have been driven from America as the reverse."

It does not seem to have occurred to any of the old writers to imagine that American people might have populated Asia, but it is strange that so few of the thinkers and writers since then have not thought that the migration just as easily have been from America to the Old World. It isn't such a "topsy-turvy" idea. There is just as much scientific reason for stating that all mankind originated in America as there is to hold that Asia *had to* give America its inhabitants. Logically one is as easy as the other.

In "The Story of America" by Collins, we read: "Whether the Indians came from Asia, or the Asiatics from America, is not established."

So we see that the exact opposite of the old propagated phantasy is now being considered.

The one-tracked mind sees it as being so easy to journey from Asia to America, but unthinkable for the American to migrate from America to Asia! Why the unchanging conviction? Why so little originality of thought? Why

not reverse the journey? Might not the drift of population have been from west to east? One theory is as easy to prove as another!

It has been claimed, with some show of verity, that it is the Japanese people who most nearly resemble the Amerinds, except as to stature. H. G. Wells goes so far as to say: "It is not impossible that they are a back-flow of the trans-Pacific drift." Maybe you're right, Mr. Wells. The Japanese did not drive the Ainus to the mountains and colonize those islands until 667 B.C.

Of a truth the Amerind is older than the Japanese; but why not a first-flow?

Professor Loren L. Hansen in a very recent article writes of the time "when the land surface of Europe ran much farther out than it does today—we are dealing with a much narrower Atlantic, some ancient Americans of the east coast invaded Spain during the first interglacial across the Labrador — Iceland — England land bridge about the twelfth millennia B.C. during the times of human catastrophe owing to floods and unstable sea levels which forced migrations from perils. That these early people had some type of migration boat may also be granted these long-heads."

This he calls the Cro-Magnon invasion of Europe. These Azilian long-heads were tall warriors of the Eagle Totem who pressed into the rich plains of Europe during the Pleistocene. When the second interglacial caused the rapidly widening Atlantic it left the Azilians in Europe. America was the only logical homeland for such a crossed type to have originated since it is the home of the Cro-Magnan type. The most ancient American type. The distribution of the Eagle and feather culture certainly bears out such an American center. These people left pictures of themselves in the caves of Spain, they were of the Eagle Totem hunting with bow and arrow in typical Indian fashion. The similarity of the feather diadems to those worn by the Sioux and the Aztec people is undeniable. A point in favor of

American origin. They buried the body in a crouched position. That the feather diadems are similar to those worn by the Aztecs and the Sioux is undeniable, thus tracing the origin of the invasion while more clues are found in the Amerindian-like crouched burials of the most ancient American type shows the American or American-directed origin."

Recent scientific writings certainly more than suggest that Amerinds invaded the eastern hemisphere ages ago. Hrdlicka, before his death, had come to regard the Amerind as descended from the Cro-Magnon man, but the weight of authority seems to point to the reverse being the case. We referred to the supposed inhabitants of Atlantis finding refuge among people of America. We might justifiably imagine refugees also finding asylum with Europeans, which land was probably nearer still to the cataclysm; according to authenticated maps. We cannot dismiss the existence of Atlantis as a myth, though descriptions of its wealth and greatness must of necessity be mythical.

This author knows the Canary Island people, and can credit the probability of such a source. In another part of this work he has commented on the origin of the Basques of Spain and France.

Lewis Spence also leans to the belief that Europe was settled by way of the Atlantic. Ehrenreich says: "Some of the ancient men of Brazil show affinities with the prehistoric men of Europe."

Charles Wolcott Brooks argues for an American origin of Old World populations, suggesting that America spilled over into Europe many ages ago. Professor Baudouin is "confident" that the ancient American discovered Europe.

Again we have the revolutionary English scholar Colonel James Churchward, who spent twelve years in India, claiming recently that he was able, with the assistance of an Old Hindu priest, to decipher the peculiar script found upon certain ancient tablets, hidden in the vaults of a temple for centuries, recording that Asia had been colonized 16,000 years ago from a land in the western sea. Smile as we may

at this new claim, it is at any rate as plausible as the bald assertion that America was colonized from Asia or from Europe. So while we come from nowhere and arrive nowhere, the "merry-go-round of speculation indicates that scientific minds are thinking back farther than they did yesterday.

Richard Clavering, an English writer upon scientific subjects, insists that the migrant race of Cro-Magnons that appeared in Europe about 50 thousand years ago bore no relationship whatsoever to the Neanderthal type then dwelling in Europe. He claims that they were of a much higher order, of superior physical build and intelligence, and that they were the outcome of many years of progressive evolution somewhere else. But where? How did they reach Europe? Not from the East—the traditional birth-place of the human race—and certainly not from the north, but of necessity from the west or southwest. He tells us that the Cro-Magnon skulls in Europe and the prehistoric skulls found in Brazil suggest an identity of type. He continues by affirming that much which is called "Egyptian" originated elsewhere than in Egypt and reached there from a westerly direction.

Were the Grimaldi men Europeans, and the Cro-Magnon race strangers hailing from some land to the west and southwest, who had come over the "land-bridge" already mentioned across the Atlantic?

One author writes, "If American man was here tens of thousands of years ago, and was then fully *human*, who can say that he did not antedate the Cro-Magnon man of Europe, or was not of another strain living contemporaneously but in widely-separated lands, or that some of them did not wander over by way of Atlantic islands and appear in Europe?

Is it suggestive that the ancient Egyptians always painted themselves a red color, and considered themselves higher than the surrounding races whom they painted brown.

Dr. Retzius long ago reported to the Smithsonian In-

stitute his idea that Egypt was settled by Atlantic people.

Columbus discovered a geologically old world—a world which Dr. Ameghino of Buenos Ayres holds to be so ancient that he claims it as “the incubator of all world life; the radiation center of all human stock.”

Brasseur de Bourbourg made America the cradle of the whole human race. As does Colonel Galindo.

Dr. Falb, the great German scientist, holds that “the high places of Peru and Bolivia must be regarded as the point of exit of the human race.”

Dr. Spinden, of the Brooklyn Museum, tells us that the ancestors of all mankind evolved in the State of Wyoming, U. S. A.

The cloud which was no bigger than a man's hand is growing larger. Men everywhere are beginning to think for themselves. Medieval chains may hold some men all of the time, some men some of the time, but they can't hold all of the men all of the time. Many are scrambling for the exit out of their doldrums—proof of doubt about old-fashioned ideas.

Now, lastly, the Indian is claimed as the original man of all, and that he populated the rest of the earth.

When men's mind are imprisoned for so long, they sometimes overleap the bounds when liberated.

When will these bewildered ones realize that the earth—not one-half only, but both halves of the world—were the area of evolution and creation?

We have traced the multifarious ways men have imagined to bring the Red Man from the Orient, but surely the human mind could not conceive a more unusual dream than the following, which we give as the prize winner of all. It remained for a Twentieth Century scientist to work out the most ingenious and the wildest of all schemes to bring the Red Man from Asia.

From a private letter we received from a noted scientist we quote the words: “The progenitor of the ape evolved in America, but crossed over the land bridge to Europe,

where they evolved into real apes, then real men, and returned to America by way of Behring Straits."

From the statements just quoted, given as matters of fact, we see that imagination is as strong today as it was 400 years ago when the Spanish clergy brought the population of America by angel airships; and the inborn urge to bring man from Asia is just as insistent. It would take a more facile pen than ours to do justice to such a story, or the vivid imagination and descriptive powers of Jules Verne to envision anything more *hypothetical* than what is involved in the words just quoted.

Such a story might run as follows: Once upon a time some strange incipient creatures were evolved in the State of Wyoming, U. S. A. When their remains were discovered millenniums later they were given the name of Taurians. It would appear that some of those Taurians had strong aspirations towards a higher life, and a few of those creatures left old Wyoming and in some way unstated, managed to reach the eastern seaboard of America. With faith unshakable as Gibraltar in their high destiny, they there embarked for another world. Impelled by an urge irresistible, they crossed the Ocean on floating logs (or what have you!), walking on all-fours where there were islands, and eventually reached Europe. However, this was not to be the terminal of their journey, as they found there was no "evolution" working there. The European atmosphere was just as incapable of transforming them into human beings as the American air had been! Nothing daunted, they started farther eastward. (Perhaps even in that distant epoch it was known or believed at least (as is still the case in many quarters), that Asia was the only initiatory land. If so, it is indeed an ancient belief, which may account for its tenacious hold). After many wanderings, ever eastward, they finally arrived in Asia. Only Oriental air could make a monkey of Tarsius.

In a different climate and environment, in the course of many, many centuries two of those creatures (?) evolved

into apes, turning out, by the merest accident, to be male and female! After trying first one method and then another, during many eons, and each successive attempt resulting in failure, "evolution" succeeded in hitting upon the right procedure to follow, and those two apes developed into real humans! By luck or Fate's decree, once more these happened to be a male and a female of the species. Those two "humans"—the only two such in all the wide, wide world, and the real "Adam" and "Eve" of evolution—were naturally highly elated at their marvelous metamorphosis. They could *now* stand or walk on *two legs* instead of their quondam *four*, and they began to multiply and populate the whole land with their own species.

While this epochal event was transpiring, sad to relate the mills of "evolution" were not turning a wheel in America. In fact, there was a "sit down strike" in the western world! For some reason or other, evolution could get no farther along the pathway. So the related Tauriuns, left behind in Wyoming died out, and they were interred deep in the slime of the Pleistocene Age! The fortunate ones that had had spunk enough to emigrate to "evolution-land" and had been "born again" in Asia, were, of course, Yellow Men!

Proud of their new dignity as "lords of creation," they advanced in every way, and as their brains expanded, some of them began to have a subconscious impression that, prior to their transformation, they had lived in another country. They seemed to recall a land in western seas, wherefrom they had wandered a long, long time previously, and they began to have a divine "nostalgia" for its wondrous rocks and rills. At first it was only a very dim recollection; but as time went on, the more intelligent of the band seemed to recollect their former experiences in the "land of the free and home of the brave" more and more vividly, and became satiated with Asia. Those "intelligentsia" became overbearing and domineering, and looked down with lordly contempt upon those of their number who were unable to en-

vision the glorious land of the west, and as men will, quarrelled over the matter. They grew *RED* with anger and vexation because the rest of the band were so stupid and unmanlike as not to be able to behold the same visions that they did. In high dudgeon, they trekked to the Asian seaboard, even going to the far North Polar Sea. What trying experiences they must have had on that awful journey! What freezing horrors they must have endured in the 70 and 80 degrees below zero stagger our imagination! How they managed to survive is a mystery insoluble! Nevertheless, "evolution" assures us that they *had to come from Siberia to America*—so journeys impossible are to be reckoned as possible, for the hypothesis in question must be homologated at all costs, and however many miracles have to be performed to make it factual! So, the *Red Man* once was a *Yellow Man*!

It chanced to be a clear day (one in a thousand that are otherwise) when they reached what is now called East Cape, and they were overjoyed to discern on the horizon their own, their native land, the beloved fatherland they had come from eons before! Hastily building canoes on that Siberian shore, they paddled across the Strait, and thus reached "home sweet home!" Their long journeys extending over uncounted ages had taken them clear around the world; but it had been well worth the effort! Hit-and-miss instinct brought them back home.

Thus the *Yellow Red Man*—after encircling the globe—began to occupy their own world again, and in the course of time they forgot the evolution-land of Asia. As yet they could not speak—for American languages were plainly evolved on this Continent.

Now, in a hemisphere of their own, they developed the power of vocal articulation called "speech" and became civilized. They built dwellings for themselves and invented many arts and sciences.

Soon after the *RED* band had departed "for lands unknown" some of those left behind turned *WHITE* with

chagrin at their own lack of enterprise, so they likewise pulled out, going to the west and the north of what is now known as "Europe."

Others of the band, left at home to be "hewers of wood and drawers of water" turned *BLACK* with shame because of their degrading tasks, and they trekked southwest into what we now call "Africa."

So the *YELLOW* men were now by themselves, quite glad to be rid of the dreamy *REDS*, the overbearing *WHITES*, and the subservient *BLACKS*! The *YELLOWS* have since then been noted as being patient, persevering and unprogressive.

Many centuries later, the *WHITES* discovered the land away between two huge oceans whither the *REDS* had emigrated, and they too began to migrate to that region. Still later, the *YELLOW ONES* desired to follow suit, but (as Kipling would say) "that's another story." Then all the various peoples of the earth desired to occupy the "Red Man's land," and incomers from every nation learned to sing lustily "*My country 'tis of thee!*"—until today natives from almost every clime on earth make the welkin ring with that musical refrain!

However, perhaps it is not such a travesty upon the truth after all, for, according to our evolutionist, all the human race was originally one, and that one was conceived in America. It is true that Asia assisted very materially; but it was *de rigueur* that there should be the life-germ from *America* to start the ball a-rolling!

It is a settled belief among evolutionists that certain countries and climates can produce what others cannot—but we can verily boast that all mankind was "laid in America" and only hatched in Asia. Does it not pander to our "amour propre" to think that Adam's granddaddy was American born!

We are sorry to think that our great, great, etc., grandparents did not send some of the corn of America to Asia in payment of their lengthy board bill! Had they done so,

and advised their relatives still in Asia that there was no wheat in America, doubtless the Yellow Men would have reciprocated by sending to them some of the wheat of their land!

The above is a fanciful story of a story, but it is, nevertheless, based upon and amplification of the actual sentences contained in a personal letter written to this author by one of the most prominent ethnologists of this land—who seemed to take for granted the factuality of what he had written! The “frills and furbelows” are ours!

So they still *had to come!* Does this prove our contention that nothing has been deemed too “far-fetched” to adduce so long as it tended to substantiate the theory that the “Amerind” came from Asia to populate America—and yet that would make the entire human race a product of this land and only a part of them brought up in the Old World!

If all animal life originated in America as scientists tell us, then all vertebrates must have been introduced to the Old World many millions of years ago. Whether the primates went along with a massed horde of other animals, or embarked alone we are not informed. Pity that so much of the intensely interesting story is omitted. The debut of man, not alone American man, should not be given out in such tabloid form. So Americans discovered and populated the Old World, for, observe there were no Europeans and *no* Asians, so there could be no intermixture of blood. Oriental air was all that was needed to put on the finishing touches.

CHAPTER XI

THE SEARCH FOR THE NON-EXISTENT

Every now and then a man's mind is stretched by a new idea and never shrinks back to its former dimension.
Oliver Wendell Holmes.

Strangely it is believed by some evolutionists that man not only evolved in the old world, but that he came from one single pair of apes, in some one as yet undiscovered spot. Or shall we write undecided on?

Now we confess that it is most natural for those who implicitly accept the Jewish cosmogony, as written, to search for an earthly Eden somewhere in the Near East. We could even understand the larger view that Paradise might be much farther East, or be in Africa, or even be in Europe; but how strange, paradoxical and utterly incomprehensible it seems that the evolutionist should be similarly engaged in a quest for one particular site—where ape became man! Of all modern evolutionary tends, that is perhaps the strangest! To believe in "evolution" as a universal law of Nature—and then limit its power to the evolving of one solitary pair, in one specific spot, is of all absurdities the *ne plus ultra*! It is comparable to a man believing in ghosts but disbelieving in fairies! Either admit that the Garden of Eden is a myth, or believe in it!

We respect the "Fundamentalist" as we do the Evolutionist, but are at a loss to understand one who tries to be both—at one and the same time! This slavish adherence of the evolutionist to the common one-pair idea is not called for.

Theological predilections and scientific thoughts make poor bedfellows!

Why does the most rabid evolutionist and the most ardent Fundamentalist worship so paradoxically at the same "one pair shrine?"

The Christian has been taught to believe in some sequestered Eden from childhood. The evolutionist believes it just as strongly, though he naively persuades himself he has a different reason.

The science of evolution would be no more credible than a fairy-tale if it taught such an utterly fantastic thing as that one pair only of humans evolved from one pair of apes in one specific localized Arcady!

It is ridiculous to imagine all the forces of Nature in the form of evolution working through countless ages in every corner of the globe and finally bringing forth only one single specimen pair of humans in one special part of the earth. Did evolution produce only one brace of pheasants, one pair of bears, only two serpents? Yet evolutionists talk and write of a "local area," "a distributing center," and search for such a spot! The paternity of a myth is often hard to trace but in this case it is obvious.

If evolution implied any such conclusion as that, it would be unworthy of serious consideration, much less acceptance. Science is above all common-sense, if it be real science.

One ethnologist writes that "The life forms which eventually evolved into the present human race, did originate on some particular part of the planet and then gradually spread over the earth."

What? Among all the millions of apes in all the world, in all the ages, in only one sequestered spot were there only one deemed worthy to be exalted to humanity? Surely our correspondent could not believe such an eventuality. Can it be possible that anyone can build a sure belief on such a gamble as this? What if one of those elect had died before maturity? What if they had failed to produce offspring? No, reader. One place and one pair is ridiculous. That is self evident common sense.

There is a pamphlet from the pen of Henry Thomas,

Ph.D., wherefrom we cull the sentence: "All of us, regardless of the color of our skins, are cousins by virtue of our common descent from a single simian forefather." We note that he, too, holds tenaciously to the "one Adam" idea.

Why a common ancestor? Why not say: A common Creator?

Nay, from the sentence as it stands, not even an "Eve" was necessary!

We could not imagine a God creating one pair of humans; and it is quite beyond our imagination to think that in all the ages, in every clime and climate, evolution could only produce one single specimen of ape-man! That wouldn't be "evolution!" It would be one blind chance in uncounted billions! Also it would be preposterous to say that man could evolve in the Orient and then deny that he could evolve in America!

Whether or not we subscribe to all the tenets of evolution, its teaching demands respect. Darwin and the rest of the immortals taught no such fantastic theory of chance, but had a well-defined and intelligently-worked-out science of reason.

To our mind, "Occidental" and "Oriental" do not mean "accidental!"

Evolution spells law, design, plan—not one isolated fortuitous "happenstance!"

Moreover, that strange imaginary creature must have found and married at least one ape-woman! And if two such creatures existed why not postulate more?

If the evolutionist argues that we take too literally his words "a common ancestor" and says that he means "man in the plural sense," then why does he search for some one locality where such evolution took place? If bird and beast had a world-wide circulation, and if evolutionary processes operated throughout the entire globe, why limit the evolution of man to one spot or one country? Why not simultaneous evolvments?

It is amusing to read that such-and-such a place is believed by so-and-so to be the spot where mankind first appeared.

According to this incomprehensible search, evolution was not a "far off divine event to which the whole creation moved," but a single specific happening, an accident, an individual freak, which in some one sharply defined locality brought forth a man-being. That such an evolution would require another such being before precreation of the genus could commence, does not seem to have been considered! If two evolutions, then, why not many? Moreover, if this could occur in one country, why not in others?

"Why must it be assumed that human life originated in some one spot? The assumption is not necessary. It is possible that human life originated in two or more widely different spots." Gregory Mason.

Roy Chapman Andrews, fired with the old faith, though he would probably not admit it, searches for his "dawn man." The continent he has chosen to explore is the popular one. From time to time a few changes are rung in by men with more original thought than their fellows. Andrews goes farther east than the rest, though where the sun rises is the site where Josephus also placed his Eden, thus proving that even two thousand years ago it was an unlocated imaginary spot somewhere in the unknown. Andrews may prove that Asians came into being in Asia. He will never prove that the black or the white or the red races did.

He is convinced that the Gobi Desert is the great incubator of world-life and the locale of Paradise.

The quest will most probably end in the finding of another "mare's nest!" instead of the human nest; but such expeditions all add to the sum total of man's knowledge.

Andrews finds dinosaur eggs millions of years old, and is elated. Pity for him that Princeton explorers "steal his thunder" and later on find dinosaur eggs in the State of Montana—and still more recently such were discovered in

Florida. Mongolia may have been an ancient birthland, but it was not the only one.

Nothing has ever been found in Asia of older vintage than what we have in America.

Among the millions of "homines sapientes" that have been buried in the East, Andrews may well find a malformed cranium of bestial proportions and shape, but why go to the Gobi for that? Such skulls with the customary half-animal teeth, low forehead and other requisites may on diligent search be found in every country. One in a million may be abnormal.

It is very significant that no two of such skulls have ever been found in the same spot or even within hundreds of miles of each other.

If Andrews discovers two such near each other, we shall begin to sit up and take notice! If a cluster of them are so found, we shall take our place at his side!

It may be that in the world's history there has occurred procreation between man and ape. We do not know, but what we do know is that every country and every age has "freaks" it is extremely difficult to account for. For instance, the author met in Uruguay a man with *two noses, two mouths, and two hare lips!* An extremely odd gentleman! He was a Charrua Indian. Of course those people are as normal in the way of noses, etc., as are the Caucasians, and the man in question was simply an abnormality. Ten thousand years from now that Indian's skull may be found in the earth by some savant—to be reverently placed in a museum and have written about it whole volumes! Think of articles being penned in the millennium of the future about the double-mouthed and twin-nasal-appendaged natives of ancient Uruguay! There should not be postulated a whole race of Siamese Twins by the discovery of the relics of two or three such in the soil of Siam!

If in the coming ages the remains of "Tom Thumb" are found, will it be argued that a race of Lilliputians once lived in America!

We smile at the ignorance of the lady who declared that she had spent the whole morning in the Acropolis but failed to find the "Four Horsemen." Maybe in her tangled-up misconceptions the lady was as intelligent in her search as is the search for an Eden as the one aboriginal spot.

If an Eden of creation or evolution cannot be located; if the site is as geographically uncertain as that of the Paradise which is to come; if it has to be searched for in every clime—why insist that the American Indian is not truly aboriginal.

One writer, despairing of uniformity, writes: "It is below the moon or else above it." And of all seekers perhaps his theory comes the closest!

Much too frequently has the cradle of mankind been discovered!

The "oldest man" has variously been found in Java, in England, in China and in Germany—widely separated portions of the world. Now he is actually being found in America.

For many, many years there was a certainty that the site of the primitive Eden was in Mesopotamia; gradually a few bolder souls thought it might perhaps be farther east; then another step was taken that it could be in North Africa. When ethnologists discovered very early man in Europe, it was moved there.

Roy Chapman Andrews in a recent article, while holding strongly to the idea that Eastern Asia was the paleontological Garden of Eden, and calls the Pekin man the First Citizen, yet thinks that the Java Man and the Pekin man were of a different order. He refers to various groups developing independently, and writes, "At about the same time, or possibly earlier, that Pekin Man was running up and down the slopes of the beautiful Western Hills, another race was living in the forests of Southern England. Piltdown Man was a remarkably early human type. Other primitive races resembling Neanderthals have been given different names, such as the Rhodesian Man, Ngandong Man and the Mount

Carmel Man. It is a far scattered cry from China to England, to Germany, to Africa, and to Palestine. He also writes: "When mans' evolution had progressed to the high stage of the Cro-Magnon, several other races were established in various parts of the world." Further on he writes: "What caused different races of early man to develop?" "The broken chain of human ancestry," to use his own words, dates back to the beginning, as he so clearly, though perhaps unwittingly, shows.

After writing of early Asiatic man, Dr. de Terra says in a recent speech at the American Philosophical Society: "At the same period, around 300,000 or 400,000 years ago, other primitive men were making hand axes, a slightly different shaped stone tool, in Europe and Africa."

The new evidence clearly means that man originated more or less simultaneously in several parts of the earth.

Dr. Waldemar Kaempffert writes: "Hundreds of varieties of men, thinking men, too, have come and gone."

These are admittedly real men but of distinct species, living in the same world. How much more should the Amerind dwelling in a very distinct world be a distinct species of man?

In the words of Alexander von Humboldt: "We do not know any period of time in which the human race has not been divided. History, as far as it is based on human testimony knows of no (one) primitive race."

Gregory Mason writes: "It is not known where man originated, some say Asia, a few suggest Africa, and a very few dare to hint it might be well to investigate America's claim to the title, Cradle of the Human Race. Anyway, it is worth remembering that the mammals of America are as old as the mammals of Europe and Asia."

Besides the "root men," as these are so often termed, there are the Pekin man, the Foxhall man, the Sub-Red Crag Man. Why they were created thus, only the Creator can answer; but we observe that those contrasts between the races date back to the very beginning.

According to anthropologists these all had independent starts. It is plain then that there were corresponding and coeval developments in many lands. There was also the Java man. The "Peking" man is claimed to be "unrelated to the others," and is declared to be *not* a Chinaman.

How could anyone expect that ancient man to be a Mongolian, when found near Peking? The Chinese did not enter their present territory until 1122 B.C. Previously it was inhabited by the Lolos, a tribe utterly unlike the Mongolian type. A few of that strange old race are still to be found in the northern mountains. They remain aloof from the Chinese, and are described as having Caucasian features.

Dr. Franz Weiderveich of the Museum of Natural History says: "The Garden of Eden, to use Biblical language, was all over the Old World, in every one of the continents of Asia, Europe and Africa. Man sprang from many similar shoots in widely separated regions, more than a million years ago." And again: "Man was evolved in Asia, Europe and Africa in parallel ages, and along parallel but not identical physical and cultural lines."

Among the many variants in this eternal quest for the mother-region is the one which assures us that the human race originated in the sunken Continent of Lemuria, portion whereof is the Australia of today.

The new hemisphere was absolutely ruled out as a possibility—first by the Christian, as contrary to the Word; and by the scientist because there were no apes there. This view was strenuously held for a long time, so much so that even though an Adam was found in American soil, and proved to be a million years old, he still had not originated there.

If Asia can lay no just claim to being the incubator of the entire human race, why continue so to regard it?

The search for a first earthly Paradise is ludicrous. The quest is not scientific. May I "rub it in" if perchance by doing so I may "rub it out?" Nevertheless the search

throughout the world for the initial human motherland has been going on for agés. "Is it far away in some region old, where rivers wander o'er sands of gold?"

The author has never been able to understand why ethnologists have talked so much about a "main stem" of the human family or why a motherland should be sought so persistently, or why such motherland or such first pair *must* have been in the Old World! In all the long history of mankind upon this planet, naught has ever been found proving that human beings initially evolved or were created in Asia exclusively. No anthropologist has ever found a clue of any sort or kind that would lead him to such a belief. No meagre thread of scientific fact has ever been seen in the earth or under the earth to indicate that Asia exclusively witnessed the origin of the human family. No fanciful idea can conceive why Asia should be singled out as the sole distributing-center of mankind.

We have all met the scientist who has dropped the words "God" and "Creation" from his vocabulary but nevertheless leans to the Asiatic descent of all mankind. It is an interesting study. It shows that many centuries of heart-teaching over-ride what the mind and lips would repudiate. The negation seems to get him nowhere. Why disclaim the Jewish story of an Eden and yet seek throughout the world for a location where ape became man? Does "sense" dwindle to "nonsense" or shall we charitably say in the words of another, "They still live in the shadow of the faith, but have lost the light of the faith."

The belief in an Eden is such a deeply-ingrained one that though a man throw away his Bible he still holds to a Center, somewhere, of human beginning. It has been taken in with many generations of mother's milk.

One thing is certain. No localized zone of real estate will ever be found in any continent where a first pair were created or evolved. That geographical phantom has been sought for everywhere but found nowhere. Why postulate

any one birthplace or one birth? What a hazard that would be!

Let us admit the truth, that the only reason which the evolutionist has to search for an Eden is because he sub-consciously believes in the Genesis account of a specific site where man first appeared. Likewise, there is no other reason why he believes that there was but one "first pair." "When the soul breaks free from the arms of a superstition, bits of the talons and claws break themselves off in him." Not yet can the human mind free itself from centuries of inherited belief in an Eden. The evolutionist who can do without a Creator must still have an evolutionary zone, and he chooses the orthodox Asia, thus betraying the prejudice of his Christian education. It is significant that men think that by an act of bravado they can do away with all necessity of God, and can bring man into existence without troubling a Higher Power, yet cannot rid themselves of the old Genesis notion of a distributing-center.

It is not the theologian who is so keenly searching the earth for an Eden, but scientific men. The idea of a creation in some localized spot on the earth they rightly refuse to accept, nevertheless perversely seek throughout the world for the place where the forces of evolution culminated in the production of one primal pair of humans. It is a strange conflict of ideas. Tradition is still too strong in them to permit of their complete emancipation. Theirs is only a partial freedom. There is still within them a legacy from their forebears which has not wholly died—but they would be deeply offended if that fact were brought to their attention!

To discredit the Jewish Paradise story and still believe in an "evolutionary Eden" is manifestly absurd! The two ideas cannot run in double-harness without tangling! It is a pathetic attempt to let go and still hold on. "Conscience makes cowards of us all." Either accept the Jewish story or reject it. Intelligence cannot do both. The inhibited thought of the scientist caused through the long old dream

of a first pair holds check on them, though by their words they would indignantly deny it.

It was a bold scientist that broke the shackles of 400 years, who asserted that Eden might be in America, thus reversing all thoughts of centuries that the Old World was the evolution center. The audacity of the claim had the old school flabbergasted. True they held to the one Eden and one pair idea, but the location was revolutionary.

Since the ban on independent thought was handed down, there have been few rebels. Especially any who would diametrically challenge old habits of thought.

A great step was taken when it was argued that the Western World had a separate Paradise, all its very own. How much more reasonable does that seem? That there should be several Edens is an intelligent step forward, but the entrance of an American Dawn Man struck a sour note for the conservatives.

According to the geologists Troussart and Lund, "Brazil was the first land on earth to emerge from the primeval floods of the Tertiary Epoch of the Miocene Age, and as such may well be the true cradle of mankind."

H. L. Morgan regards the "valley of the Columbia River in Oregon as the primitive Eden of America."

Von Hellwald sharply denies "the dispersion of mankind from some mythical abode in the East."

These cumulative discoveries in so many areas of the earth are very conclusive proof that creation (or evolution, if you like) was universal. Is it not time to stop hunting for a myth?

The reader will see then that we have in this recital before us the independent rise of several varieties of widely contrasting types of true men. They are contemporaneous, and not only different, but are found in all parts of the earth.

Arthur Sanborn in a recent book, entitled *The Long-Lost Land*, carefully argues that man was created here in America where Eve first saw the light of day.

Morton claims that the Amerind has "a distinct origin, one as indigenous to the continent itself as its flora and fauna."

Agassiz learnedly contends that the Indian is ethnologically independent of the races of the old world; and that he is a product of the soil where we find him. Such likewise is the contention of Mott, of Glidden, and of an ever-increasing number of others.

"The American race stands alone, the result of a long period of development, a period which might be represented by tens of thousands rather than thousands of years." (W. H. Holmes, Chief of the Bureau of American Ethnology, Washington, D. C.)

The author concurs in the view of Blumenbach that "The American Indian is a distinct species," and with Bancroft in stating that "he differs in Character and cast of features from every other people of the world, very much unlike any other nation whatever of the old world," and with Baldwin who writes: "Unquestionably they are American aborigines and not immigrants from another continent."

There is nothing against this statement but the unchanging ideas of certain schools of thought. That they are Asian emigrants is a silly fiction foisted upon the world in a dark age!

Sir Arthur Keith, long before the latest discoveries had been made, in summing up his arguments in regard to original man in America, wisely says: "One cannot conclude such a survey as this with any feeling of satisfaction, or of certainty. The animals which have been domesticated, and the numerous native plants which have been brought under cultivation by indigenous races in pre-Columbian times, seem to point to an antiquity beyond that revealed by the discoveries of the geologist or of the anatomist. The writer feels that human secrets still lie hidden in America. The discovery of implements of a Paleolithic type in the State of Kansas under deposits of the phase of maximum glaciation suggests an earlier history for man in America."

Count Byron de Prorok of the University of Paris declares that "the Americans are an original people who sprang from the soil of that continent. Certain it is that cave men lived in America in the paleolithic epoch—about the year one hundred thousand B.C. They did not migrate from Asia, but developed through the evolutionary stages where they are found. The entire human race could have originated in America as well as in Africa or anywhere else." There is an ever-increasing number of savants who agree with Prorok.

So the ethnologists have recently taken a surprising turn of independence. It is now seen that the Amerind had no need to hale from Asia. They could do so in America—and with honors.

It is admitted that Columbus found Late Paleolithic Man in the West Indies; that later he was discovered inhabiting Northern Canada, Alaska and the Pacific Islands; that still later he was seen in the Ainus of Japan; while the Tasmanian and the Tierra del Fuego have been classified as Early Paleolithic. These lands are wide-scattered

When Darwin saw the Indians of Terra del Fuego, he doubted that they were scarcely human. The savages we have encountered in Amazonia cannot be much removed from the Neanderthal man. The low state of their mental development is shown by their disregard for time; nor have they any records or traditions of the past. No religion is known among them, nor have they any fetish rites.

Fiske holds that the Indian has been isolated from the old world for probably more than 50,000 years, and says: "The aboriginal American is most emphatically a native and not an imported article."

If the Redskin has been in America for fifty thousand years, those who insist that he "came" from somewhere will find it hard to establish proof thereof if the "Argosy" landed at such a remote time. It is at least certain no argument can prove that he arrived here before then. No Asiatic race can tell us where they were so far back as that!

Morton writes: "We find reasons to believe that the Indians must have subsisted as a separate department of nations from the earliest ages of the world."

The *Americana* has the following: "Very many millenniums have elapsed since the Red Man began his career as the autochthone of the New World."

F. A. Mitchell Hedges, a scientist of the British Museum, claims to have discovered piles of artifacts of a civilization perhaps twenty-five thousand years old in Honduras; and he affirms that "a complete reading of this riddle will necessitate a rewriting of the history of mankind." The revealing future will show much! A re-stating of the status of the Red Man is called for.

Loren C. Eiseley, Professor of Anthropology at the University of Kansas, in a very recent publication, writes: "Our search for human origins is complicated by the possibility that a varied assemblage of human types simultaneously existed in the lower (earlier) Ice Age. Which of these types is truly ancestral to modern man? Or have several played their part and was *Homo sapiens* from the start something of a mongrel breed?"

Dr. Nott writes: "The precise geological period when man first appeared on the earth has not been determined, nor what race *appeared first*."

Voltaire repeatedly ridiculed the idea of a common origin of mankind either by creation or evolution.

So the modern research for the one evolutionary spot has resulted in the finding of a score such centers, and, exasperatingly, many of them are on the American continent. So it was a remarkable western world even before it became known as America and had Yankees to run it, and the alluring fancy of 400 years proves to be nothing more than a mirage.

Much too frequently has the cradle of mankind been "discovered!"

the "oldest man" has variously been found in Java, in

England, in America, in China and in Germany—widely separated portions of the world.

In one of the latest books we have read Professor Edgar Lee Hewitt writes regarding the natives of Mexico: "They consistently hold themselves to be autocthones, they may be as they think they are, God knows." Yes, Doctor, God knows, and may we respectfully say he has told us.

Dr. W. F. Warren, one-time President of Boston University, is the author of one of the most erudite books which the present author has ever perused, and 500 pages thereof are devoted to a discussion wherein the author seeks to show that the North Pole is the common cradle of all mankind—earth's earliest "Holy Land." The work is entitled *Paradise Found*. In that work the reader is taken back to millenniums ago, when this globe of ours was being formed and while it was still hot.

Dr. Warren seeks to show that as the newly born planet cooled, the North Pole was the first portion of the earth's face ready to sustain life.

Strange as the idea may seem at first mention of the location, we have read no more plausible or soundly-scientific work. We there see created beings gradually spreading southward as the earth cooled.

As American land is nearest to the Pole—in fact the Magnetic Pole is in America—that land became the home of living creatures; the first zone of life.

Abundant proof has been found that these ancient and primitive people grew up in America, in the world's earliest years. The "foot-prints on the sands of time" have been pointed out—and show the Amerind to be no "transplanted" man. There is not in our opinion a shadow of doubt as to the truth of this. Cumulative proof is overwhelming.

The evidence is too conclusive to leave any doubt but that man existed on this Continent at least tens of thousands of years ago. Disconcerting as those discoveries

may be to some, they are facts which it is not the part of wisdom to ignore.

The world's most eminent authorities concur in stating that the American man lived here as early as man lived anywhere else. We accept their findings and throw overboard our boyish beliefs to the contrary. The Amerind is thus seen to be the one and only "pure" race on the earth—though in this connection perhaps the Australian Black man should not be omitted.

Quoting from Gregory Mason: "The prudent layman will do well to remember that it is too early to determine the age of man in America, or in any other continent, or to say dogmatically that man originated here or there.

One of the world's most noted men says: "It must be clearly understood that the origin of the American Indian is highly speculative. The whole problem forms one more racial mystery which has thus far defied solution."

Enock, writing of the many conjectures current regarding the origin of the Amerind, sums up thus: "Beyond these theories there still remains that of an autochthonous origin; and who shall yet affirm that both the people and their civilization may not have sprung and evolved upon the soil of the world which we call 'new.'"

Prof. Alexander of the University of Nebraska says: "It is certain that South America has been inhabited from remote times; it is certain, too, that her civilizations are ancient, reckoned even by Old World scale. A daring hypothesis would make this continent an early, and, perhaps, the first home of the human species."

One scientist writes us: "In all probability the Indian has existed on the American continents as long as, or perhaps longer than, the other races have existed on their respective continents. There is as much ground for assuming that he was an original creation as there is that any other race was an original creation."

The Red Man, who for so many centuries had to be pro-

vided with ancestors is now seen by some to be the grand-daddy of all.

So far from his being an offshoot of another land and people, research shows that more probably the Red Man is the oldest of all the races. Signs are pointing to the conclusion that the Amerind, the new immigrant, is contrarily an original homo-sapiens.

More and more the Amerind is being recognized as a "First Edition," duly so ticketed, and the day is dawning when he will be plainly tagged "Homo No. 1; Color, Red; Habitat, America!"

A NEW OLD WORLD

World wrongly called the New
 This clime was old
 When first the Spaniards came
 In search of gold;
 Cities rose, ruled, dwindled to decay,
 Empires were formed
 Then darkly passed away.

CHAPTER XII

AN OLD WORLD AND AN OLD HUMANITY

We dwell apart, afar
 Within the unmeasured deep, amid its waves
 The most remote of men; no other race
 Hath commerce with us.

Odyssey

Europe in 1600 exulted in the thought that a New World had been discovered. But was it a new world or just a newly-found one? In the fever of the epoch-making discovery, when the minds of men were not able to divorce themselves from the word "new," such (newness) might have been quite reasonably conjectured; but the misconception of the Middle Ages can no longer be defended. The term "new" is a misnomer. What was then thought to be "new" was soon found to be hoary with age! The crude ideas of that day must be discarded, because the geologic "finds" indicate that American land is as old as any other. Here we see revealed the very bed-rock of creation.

The Dominion of Canada has over two million square miles of pre-Cambrian rock—the oldest in earth's history.

The real Rock of Ages is the Laurentian Range in Canada.

The first sedimentary stone made from the primeval slime prove that this Continent was formed at the creation of the world. Geologically, the western half is as old as the eastern.

Long ago Baldwin stated "Geologically, America is the oldest of the continents." It is known as the mother of the earth.

In the course of a personal letter to the author of this

book, Dr. Spinden of the Brooklyn Museum says: "You are perhaps right in thinking that the new world is, on the whole, a more ancient land-mass than the old world."

So it is plain that America is not a land just created or in the course of creation!

The Europe of A.D. 1600 was unable to discover, or imagine, or digest knowledge of this kind. Many years were to pass, and the phrase "new world" had sufficient time to become deeply-rooted and universally-accepted as descriptive of this country before it was found to be an extremely ancient, though a *newly-found* continent.

The oldest living things on the planet were later to be found in California—trees deeply rooted in American soil—before Abraham was called out to lead the Jewish Nation. If "Only God can make a tree," He made trees to grow in American atmosphere.

It is not significant that in this so-called "New" World we also find the oldest forms of animal life? That scientists claim this Continent as the birthplace of a myriad forms?

In the very remote past—an era so remote that the earth's waters were then in a different relation to the land from what they now sustain—when "Father Time" himself was young, living creatures roamed the plains and mountains of this Western World. Underneath the sod which the early-comers had considered virgin, were found bones of animals that must have been interred millions of years ago! How was it to be guessed that the most *newly-found* land should prove to be perhaps the *oldest formed*—and perchance the first one to be inhabited by animal life?

"Thus we are forced to conclude that the primordial occupancy of this continent antedates present geographical conditions and points to a remote time, which can be discovered only on geological and biological investigation." Major Powell, formerly Chief of the Smithsonian Institute.

The early inference that "America" was a *new* land was the cause of many an erroneous conclusion. Asia was old.

America was "new." The latter was the land to which emigrants from Asia might go—ergo, it has always been the "mecca" of emigrants! According to the popular notion, Asia was the original human "hive," and America the overflow land therefrom.

But the newly-found land was inhabited by *millions* of people! All the contiguous islands on both coasts were peopled—probably before any human eyes ever beheld Mongolia!

The terms "Old World" and "New World" are comparatively modern and not geologically accurate expressions. If a snake tempted a lady called Eve six thousand years ago, or even sixty thousand, its great, great, great, etc. grandparent had been lying in the rocks of Patagonia for 45 million years! This antiquity is according to the Natural History Museum of New York City, where his petrified length of 35 feet can now be seen.

Why is it that America contains more fossilized remains of ancient animals than does any other country?

Geologists also find rare specimens of the transition stages between amphibians and vertebrates all over the continent. Geology is the greatest "detective story" ever written and the most enduring. It is written in rock.

Dr. Oliver Hay of the United States Museum writes as follows: "It is significant that the Florida diggings show far more extinct species than are shown anywhere else in the world—animals that are known to have lived during the so-called Aftonian times." The "Alpha" of the world's life.

As these lines are being written, Curator Nichols, geologist of the Field Museum, announces in a leaflet published by the Museum that "organic plant-life and animals flourished here in the Chicago area six hundred millions of years ago."

Think of the *Dimetrodon* lizard dug up in Texas and reputed to be two hundred million years old!

The *World's Press* has just informed its readers of the

discovery in Argentina of the Atlanto-Saures, dwarfing in size even our northern animals, and also the finding of the remains of eagles with heads as large as those of the present-day horses!

The oldest and largest of all prehistoric animals are found in America. Think of the *Eozoon Canadense*, the most ancient creature on record. Asia cannot show animals of older vintage. Why it is supposed that all life had to "come" hither, we cannot figure out.

Those animals did not swim from Asia to America; nor did the pterodactyl fly. They didn't have to "come." The only plausible explanation of their presence here is that they were created or evolved *where we find them*.

Dr. Simpson of the American Museum of Natural History tells us that he "found undoubted evidence that Patagonia was the spot where mammals first originated; that the species found there fill up a fifty-million-year gap." It is a pretty ancient continent that can fill up a gap of 50 million years.

It is claimed that the footprints on a slab found in the State of Ohio were made by an animal that walked over soft mud some 200 millions of years ago. These may well be the prints of the world oldest feet!

Professor Agassiz, whose authority will hardly be question in matters of this kind, tells us that geology finds the world's oldest landmarks in America. This, Sir Charles Lyell corroborates.

Will anyone pretend that these animals were created in pairs, or had their origin in Mesopotamia?

The naturalist must infer that fauna and flora of the two continents were contemporary.

Unless we admit of a world wide creation how are we to account for the presence of life on this isolated and inaccessible Western Hemisphere.

Plants, insects, birds, animals and men were here in America when it was first revealed to Europe.

How had they come into being?

Just as they did in other lands.

Their origin is no more mysterious than is the origin of the other classifications. Forms of life are found in everything and everywhere. The smallest atoll of the Pacific Ocean has its quota of living creatures. No single area upon this planet (and it is probably likewise the case in other worlds) is devoid of life. On good authority we are assured that "nature abhors a vacuum."

All life is life, whether insect or human. All must be God-breathed. The riddle is not in human life, but the key problem is in life itself. This should be especially so to those who regard man as an animal.

How can any individual admit that wild *animal* life is indigenous to this soil, but hold that *human* life *must have "come"* here? Strange that a person should readily "swallow" the former fact but "choke" on the latter.

If the fauna and flora are admitted to be indigenous, why deny the indigeneity of man? Why drag in a Mongolian ancestry for *Him*?

If American animals did not come out of the Ark, why insist that all *men* did? The same Creator (or evolutionary force if you will) could cause American man's origin.

The primal origin of the Red Man is hidden in the depths of a by-gone eternity—but so is likewise that of the Black Man!

In some way each is an effluence from the Godhead.

Huxley says: "The problem of the origin of the human race is the question of questions." Why, then, confine our "Questionings" to the Fountain Spring of the *Red* tribes?

In God's mysterious way and in His mysterious past, He breathed and the Amerind lived. He spent his first birthday upon American soil away back in the springtime of the world. Biped and quadruped alike are autochthonous.

Out of the vastness that is God, came man, somehow and some when. Nature is infinite and science can only touch its fringe.

In the fullness of time, in the Creator's own way, man appeared here to take his place in the sun and inherit the earth. In some way the unbegotten had a birth.

America, when discovered four centuries ago, was found to be inhabited from the Arctic to Cape Horn, and from ocean to ocean, by a population displaying peculiar physical traits, unlike any races in the Old World; speaking languages bearing no resemblance in structure to any other languages, and living everywhere among animals and plants specifically distinct from those of Europe, Asia, Africa and Oceania.

Now the question naturally springs up, whether the Aborigines of America were not contemporary with the earliest races, known to us, of the eastern continent? If, as is conceded, Caucasian, Negro, Mongol, and other races, existed in the Old World, already distinct, what reason can be assigned to show that the Aborigines of America did not also exist, with their present types, 50,000 years ago? All facts and all analogy were against the supposition that America should have been left by the Creator, a dreary waste for thousands of years, while the other half of the world was teeming with organized beings. This view is also greatly strengthened by the acknowledged fact, that not a single animal, bird, reptile, fish, or plant, was common to the Old and New Worlds. No naturalist of our day doubts that the animal and vegetable kingdoms of America were created where they are found, and not in Asia. The races of men alone, of America, have been made an exception to this general law; but this exception cannot be maintained by any course of scientific reasoning.

Since the discovery of America the Spanish words "Mundo Nuevo" have had their equivalent in every language almost, and much stress has been laid upon the "new." At the beginning it was actually thought that the American Indian had in some miraculous way just immediately preceded the Spaniards. The more thoughtful, however, considered his arrival to have been at least hundreds

of years earlier. However, everybody thought of him as comparatively-speaking a new-comer.

There were those who began to give approximate dates as well as routes—just as there are those who with no greater wisdom set a definite date for the end of the world.

A medical student remarked recently in our hearing "The Indians have no more right here than we have; they just happened to get here a little ahead of us!"

It is noteworthy that not a year passes but what savants place farther and still farther back the advent of man in America. The arrival of Mr. Indian has been retrojected from hundreds to thousands and now from tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands of years!

The Amerind is an American. Never was outside of the land we now know as "America." He "belongs" here in a deeper and truer sense than do any other people to the lands they inhabit. The student of history can recall but few nations of the Old World that have not within times historical migrated to the country they now call their own. In sharp contrast with them, we find that "America" is the Amerind's ancestral home—he was never anywhere else! This is his original fatherland. His "tap-roots" so to speak are deep in American soil.

The American Indian tells us that the Great Spirit made him in America. We are not personally aware of any better or more intelligible explanation. He believes it and so do we; though the many frills wherewith he decorates the statement we may reject.

Trace humanity as far back as we may in the eastern hemisphere and we still find an American race living coevally with them. There is no sign that man ever came here from there, or that he went there from here.

In "Ancient Society" Morgan writes: "The existence of mankind in America extends back immeasurably and loses itself in a vast and profound antiquity."

Man is as old here as elsewhere.

That this strange and peculiar generation of Amerinds

have been here from time immemorial is attested by the fact that their bones are found mingled with those of long-extinct quadrupeds. That the Amerind lived coevally with the three-toed horse is proved by carvings in the solid rock. Such pictures not only take us back into the far reaches of time, but prove that even then he was a real man with artistic ability.

None of the drawings in South Africa or in France (so frequently referred to) lead us so far back in human history.

Dr. Hamy in *Zoologie du Mexique* says: "All that can be affirmed is that a man whose anthropologic characteristics are still undetermined lived before the final geologic events which gave America its actual formation, and that man was the contemporary of the gigantic animals."

Traces of his existence in the glacial epoch have been found in abundance, and bones of both mastodon and man are frequently seen in the same gravel-bed.

Professor Geikie of Scotland says: "Along with the mylodon, megatherium, mastodon and mammoth, lived ancient man."

Keith writes: "There can remain no doubt of the existence of man on this continent in an epoch anterior to that in which the last races of the gigantic animals become extinct."

In the magazine *Popular Science* Saporta rightly says: "The American man has left indisputable traces of his presence in the remote ages."

To find sabre-toothed tigers drawn on the walls of European caves is sufficient proof to the scientists of Europe that early man saw those animals. That fact is readily admitted. When we gaze at cave paintings and carvings in Arizona of dinosaurs, accurately-depicted, why not naturally conclude that the Amerinds lived coevally with the dinosaur? Scientists willingly admit the former (European sabre-toothed tigers), but they baulk at the notion of there being such early American men because it is so con-

trary to the old schools of thought. To see those gigantic animals depicted by human hands in the early morning of the world should be sufficient proof to the unprejudiced that the Red Man actually saw them. These carvings upset many archeological calculations.

Fossilized bones of early man have been discovered in Nebraska in the Spring of 1939 at a depth of 40 feet. Professor Bertrand Schultz of the Nebraska University estimates the remains to be 25,000 years old, but these discoveries do not seem to make a dent in the obsession of some minds.

We have also in this country conclusive evidence of the existence of man before the time of the glaciers, and from the primitive conditions of that time, he has lived and developed through stages which correspond in many particulars to the Homeric age of Greece," (F. W. Putnam's Report to the Peabody Museum of Archeology).

America has a pre-history extending back to the earliest ages of man's beginnings. Here on our soil we can trace his progressive steps and successes. The various stages of human development are as clearly outlined in Mexico as they are in any eastern land. Every art clearly shows an American development. If we go deep enough, we will find the crudest of stone implements, whereas as we rise higher these give place to veritable works of art in copper, silver and gold.

"Rich as the American Continent is known to be in material wealth, it is also the richest of all the continents in ethnological and archeological materials, illustrative of the great period of barbarism." Morgan in *Ancient Society*.

All discoveries point to the fact that America has been continuously inhabited by human beings since the first Pleistocene times, if not earlier. James Wilson's discovery on the Coast of Ecuador of articles of pottery and gold in a stratum of mould beneath the sea-level and covered by several feet of clay proves (according to Murchison) that "within the human period, the lands on the west coast were

depressed and submerged and that after the accumulation of marine clays above the terrestrial relics the whole coast was elevated to its present position, 200 feet higher." If, then, the existence, not only of the human race, but of human art in America, antedates the present conformation of the continent, how futile must be every attempt to connect its early history with Asia."

The past decade has seen many of the bolder thinkers come out in direct opposition to the old idea. The ranks of the cautious ones are thinning. Many are being freed from the thralldom of that evil "jinn" of the past—a mental attitude which just accepts things without question.

At the Kansas City, Mo., Convention of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Byron Cummings, professor of archaeology at the University of Arizona took vigorous exception to the "fashionable" view (even science has its modes!) that man first appeared in North America at the earliest some three to ten thousand years ago. Later, his address was published in *Science*, wherefrom we quote: "The problem of the origin and relationships of the American cultures will never be properly solved until there is a greater collaboration of results. Full investigation and careful tabulation of results have too often been retarded by the storm of ridicule and abuse that has been heaped upon the heads of those who brought to light anything unusual. Some of our leading anthropologists have condemned, without a hearing, facts that are really incontrovertible, and good men have been hounded from the profession by others who happened to hold the center of the stage at the time. A few years ago some U. S. geologists were making investigations in Southern Arizona. One of them was kind enough to address the faculty and students of the University of Arizona on some skeletal remains of the mammoth that had been found in our country. At the close of the address, the writer of this article suggested to the speaker that it would be fine if he and his associates would continue their investigations

in this old lake-bed until they uncovered some fossil remains of man. The answer came back quick and straight: 'Not on your life! If we find any human bones in those fossil-beds, we'll bury them instanter, pack our luggage, and ask to be transferred to some other locality. We are not going to risk our professional reputation by finding any Pleistocene man.' "

It seems to be almost a crime to bring to light anything new—anything that contradicts our already-published theories. Men uncover the bones of Pleistocene animals in California, in Arizona and many other places, and the "finds" are accepted as genuine without question. But if a *human* bone or implement should be encountered in the same stratum or in a similar one, *its* presence must be "accounted for" in some other way! Primitive crania are found in the ancient caves of the arid plateau of our southwest and encountered in Mexico thirty feet below the surface, buried eighteen feet beneath an ancient lava flow; but the chins of these crania do not accord in form and line with the Neanderthal type in Europe—and thus it cannot be primitive! It matters not that the ruins of a different (yet prehistoric) people lie above them, and that the dust of ages envelopes them! It matters not that 18 feet of gradual deposit, 20 feet of lava and 2 feet of surface-soil lie above them! They don't "conform"—hence cannot be right! In fact, "conformity" seems to be becoming a racial as well as an ecclesiastical requirement in our national life! Unless we travel in the grooves made for us by our self-appointed superiors, we must get off the highway! We have no place either upon or behind the band-wagon! We must follow the crowd and become a rooter or the manager of the show will publish us to the alumni and brand us traitors. Too often the scientific worker finds himself backed against a wall, and his hands tied, because the results he is reaching do not satisfy someone in the superior council or some pet patron. Plans are changed, funds are withdrawn, results are questioned and a blank corporate

stare greets the investigator instead of the smile of human interest and cheer that he had a right to expect. He must work out someone's pet theory or serve someone's greed, or his work is not worthwhile." These facts are their own commentary. Conformity is not exactly the first law of nature but it comes close to being the first law of discretion.

The question to be asked is: "Do these findings conform to sane geological requirements?" and it is affirmed positively that they do. If they merely fail to conform to preconceived ideas and beliefs—if they are rejected merely because they are disturbing and unwelcome and would entail an "about turn" on the part of old-established thought—these are not sufficient grounds for rejection. Why this gag rule?

How distinctly do we recall our own experiences in the halls of learning. When asked a question, all we had to do was to quote verbatim the pat phrase of Prof. So-and-So, in the textbook. Whether we understood it or believed it or not mattered little! We were all Charlie McCarthys.

By such men a college lecture is a process by which the contents of a professor's notebook are transferred by mechanical means to a student's notebook; without passing through the mind of either.

The professor was very frequently just a textbook wired for sound, who frequently taught what he did not himself believe. Bishop Waldorf, writing to his son in college says: "Don't be a herd thinker. Don't accept a precept simply because everyone else does. There is a general tendency to follow the crowd in fashion, action and thought."

America has suffered from what we might term "Old Worlditis."

With all of our vaunted independence, we still follow to a great extent the trend of Old World thought. The rarest thing in the world is really original thinking.

We eagerly look for and welcome all real discoveries but unsubstantiated guesses by uninformed has been for too

long all that has been given us to read about the Amerind, also when men of equal prominence differ so radically from each other, and when there is so much debate and so much doubt expressed, we are at liberty to decide for ourselves on which side lies the preponderance of evidence and form our conclusions accordingly.

Some of them have changed so much, so often, that we are at a loss to understand where they are now. The layman who pins his faith to the sayings of this or that scientist should remember that they are markedly discordant in their views.

Professor Maynard Kreuger of the University of Chicago in an address delivered recently rightly accused textbook writers and teachers of "doing their best to develop a generation of spineless people." For some it is unfortunate that new facts stubbornly refuse to conform themselves to old theories! "Does this or that agree with my opinion? If not, away with it!" seems to be the attitude of many. This has done America a colossal injustice. For instance, the tools which European man in the Early Stone Age were merely chipped. In the Later Stone Age his tools were polished as well as chipped; whereas in America in very remote times stone tools were both chipped and polished. However, if from this fact you seek to argue that the Early Stone Age Man was a better workman in America or that his history goes farther back in America than in Europe, you will bring down upon your head the wrath of the "orthodox" anthropologist. Cold facts are heresy to such, despite all proof.

The author is not a follower of any one particular school of thought. It has been his highest pleasure to visit sites of ancient culture in both hemispheres. He has kept an open mind and attentive ear for the voices of those whose life-work entitles them to the highest respect. He believes in the adage "Hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may."

Dr. Albert E. Jenks of the University of Minnesota writes:

"Natural scientists learned for the first time, in 1856, that mankind had inhabited Europe as early as the Glacial Age. Since then it has been discovered that men also lived in Africa and in Asia during glacial time. Very naturally it has been asked, where and when did Glacial Age man live in America? Since it is known that early man lived in Europe, Africa and Asia, is it not probable that he lived also somewhere in the Western Hemisphere? We have long believed it probable that man was in America before the close of glacial time."

Scientists led by Dr. H. E. Anthony of the American Museum of Natural History have recently completed an 11-day research expedition to Shiva's Temple, a wooded plateau towering a mile and a half above the Grand Canyon of the Colorado and believed to have been severed from the mainland for from 12,000 to 35,000 years. Among the small animals captured for the study of the evolutionary results of isolation were species of rats, mice, chipmunks, rabbits, squirrels and other rodents. Laboratory experiments will attempt to prove they have undergone evolutionary changes. At this writing no change whatever has been found. But, and this is the important point we wish to emphasize here, those explorers found *numbers of arrow chips*, not arrows which presumably might have been shot there, but *arrow chips* left by men who had worked there those many millenniums ago. What may yet be found on Shiva's Temple is intriguing.

In the light of findings such as these, how are we to regard the theory that the Amerind is a "newcomer?" Why must the Asian be granted priority of origin? Why regard the Amerind as a "transplanted" man?

Surely such discoveries demand that there be some rearrangement of our thought. No longer can we close our eyes to the facts which confront us.

In his *New Light on Prehistoric Cultures*, Maynard

Shipley writes: "The cradle of civilization seems now to have shifted from Asia to Central America. Discoveries made in the new world during recent years, in Mexico, Guatemala and Colombia, seem to indicate that a rather high state of civilization had been attained in the Western Hemisphere at a time when the inhabitants of the Valley of the Nile were still backward. It is now known that the civilization of ancient Mexico may date back to the eighth millennium B.C."

Professor Niven, the Scotch archeologist, who has worked passionately and ceaselessly in the buried cities of Mexico for thirty years, reports that he has found the remains of a race of men in the deepest known volcanic ash—*the oldest civilized men on earth!* Dr. Buxton, Professor of Human Anatomy at Oxford, England, has examined these skulls and writes: "They are those of the people who built the greatest pyramids on earth—larger than the Pyramid of Cheops and more beautiful. They were the astronomers who made calculations and lost only one day in fifty-two years, while our calendar loses one day in four years."

When we remember that the period of civilization covers but a fragment of the race, we may well conclude that the Amerind is *old!*

An old tradition should not perpetually hold and bind the mind. If buildings found in America give every sign of having been erected in an age anterior to the erection of any in the East, and if artifacts here discovered indicate an earlier period of man's existence, then a revision of thought is undoubtedly called for.

Dr. Frank Hibben, University of New Mexico anthropologist, writes of a prehistoric "old timer" roaming the Rio Grande Valley about 25,000 years ago, "before the supposed migration from Asia," while Professor Kirk Bryan, head of the Harvard Department of Geology, estimates man was on the North American Continent maybe 30,000 years ago.

That aged scientist Dr. Robert Thomas Hill, whom we

have already quoted, saw a long time ago that the American man was distinct from all others, and that his remains are as old as any human remains found in the Old World. Recalling to mind the days of 1850, when first he saw the Indians, Dr. Hill writes: "How different from any human beings I had ever seen! Little did I realize then, as I know now, that I was looking at men of the Stone Ages of Europe—as different from us in thought and ideal and habit as any human beings that one could conceive. . . . Their fine physique, their long, sleek, black hair, their beautiful art work with buckskin, their porcupine breast plates, their wise saying, and their individual honesty."

The import of all these new discoveries demand a new orientation of thought. If the claim that America has the largest and most ancient animals of the world is admitted on all sides, why should it not be most probable that American man has also a greater age? Whether these excessive claims as to the antiquity of Columbian man are true or not, it is significant that no Old World man has ever been assigned such extreme age.

If geology indicates that American land is as old as any other—if scientists informs us correctly that the reptiles and birds found buried in American soil date back just as far as any such relics discovered elsewhere—and if the remains of man are unearthed on this continent indicating an antiquity as great as that of any such found in Europe or Asia, why must the Old World be regarded as the human nest for all living things?

It has been very amusing and also enlightening to follow the variety of opinions regarding the new discoveries, e.g.: "They are unbelievable!" "They are what we expected would be found." "They are preposterous." "They cleared up our own opinions." "They are fantastic."

It will be admitted that a large enough mass of evidence has been adduced and sufficient of the world's highest authorities quoted to cause thought. Disagree with the author

and with them if you wish to but one's ideas and decisions ought to keep pace with discoveries.

When it is a matter of the differing opinions of men of equal erudition, we are at liberty to weigh and choose.

A report of Dr. Mueller's researches (published in Germany) states that the columns of the Temple of the Sun in Tiahuanaco, Bolivia, were raised not earlier than 14,600 years ago, nor later than 10,300 years ago. The dates were ingeniously worked out by astronomical calculations from the rows of columns which were originally built as a great sun dial for the year round. By tables and mathematical calculations and by working back to the time when these columns would cast true shadows for those long-vanished astronomers, it is shown that the heavenly bodies were in such positions between the dates mentioned and have not been since. These intricate and amazing calculations were adopted by the Conference of Astronomers at Paris and give to Tiahuanaco the title of "the oldest city so far discovered on earth, thus long antedating the Babylonians and Egyptian Pharaohs."

Professor Posnansky of the Tiahuanaco Museum definitely gives the city an antiquity of thirteen thousand years.

Call these dates fantastic, if you will—cut them in two if you choose—or say that the astronomers in Paris erred in their calculations, nevertheless, when all is said and done Tiahuanaco still stands as old as the most ancient of eastern cities.

It is remarkable that now, among all the claims ever made for any land, our own America should be brought to the front in an article by Professor Byron Cummings of the University of Arizona, "About 1,000 years before Pharaoh was driving his slaves to the construction of the great pyramid of Egypt, and some 500 years before the Assyrians were mixing their sweat with the mortar that held the bricks of the great palace of Sennacherib together, some ancient chief of the Valley of Mexico was forcing his subjects to

rear a mighty structure on which to honor the gods of his land."

It is claimed by Professor Cummings and also by George Hyde, the New Zealand geologist, who have been employed by the Mexican Government under the direction of Dr. Gamio of Mexico City to unearth the ruins of Cuicuilco, that this Mexican pyramid and other buildings were covered with lava 5,000 years before Christ was born! There are definite data to show that before the lava flowed over same, they were long-abandoned ruins, covered with 15 to 17 feet of sand, gravel and rock, indicating that their builders had lived and worked thousands of years before the eruption occurred. Is it not reasonable, then, to assume that this temple was reared by primitive Americans who lived thousands of years or more back in the past?

Dr. Maximus Neumeyer, the famous Brazilian archeologist, after minute investigation, was led to the conclusion that the tower at Cuicuilco had been erected about 13,100 years ago, and predicted that if excavations were made to a depth of from 15 to 20 meters his interpretations would be verified. Skeptics may (and do) smile at this. Archeological questions like others lend themselves to hot disputation.

Fiske says: "We now know that in the earliest post-Pliocene times, if not in the Pliocene itself, at least four hundred thousand years ago, the American continent was inhabited by human beings."

Although antiquity so extreme for man's existence in America may shock some preconceived opinions, it is none the less certain that the rapid accumulation of new facts is fast familiarizing the minds of the scientific world to this conviction.

There is a mass of cumulative testimony carrying the aborigines of America back to the remotest period of man's existence upon earth.

Human Fossil remains have now been found so frequently, and in circumstances so unequivocal, that the facts

can hardly be denied; except by persons who resolutely refuse to believe anything that can militate against their own preconceived opinions.

A fossil human skeleton is preserved in the Museum at Quebec which was dug out of the solid-schist-rock on which the citadel stands which possesses all the characteristics which mark the American race in general.

A. Hyatt Verrill, in the very latest book we have seen, declares: "North America was inhabited before the glacial period, thus proving that man not only inhabited the New World in that inconceivably remote geological period but had actually advanced further in culture in America than in the Old World. Most assuredly we have every reason to think that man must have inhabited America for a longer period than Europe. Personally, I am convinced that the Indian originated in America. I know several prominent scientists who are in accord with me in this belief. If man evolved from some lower form, or was created, in Asia, or Africa, or Europe, if he has always been indigenous to any or all of those countries, why should he not have originated in America as well? Is there any valid reason to assume that if he originated or developed under certain conditions and favorable environment in the Old World, he might not have done the same in the New World under similar conditions? If, as is logical to assume, man's gradual progress from primitive, semi-human beings to a highly cultured and civilized race requires a more or less definite period of time, then, most assuredly, we have every reason to think that man must have inhabited America for a longer period than Europe. For any race to rise from primitive savagery to the heights attained by these races, for men to develop and perfect distinctive cultures and arts requires countless centuries, and as these of the prehistoric Americans were wholly distinct from those of any other portion of the world, we know that men must have dwelt in America for inconceivable ages and must have slowly evolved from lowly savages to the highly intelligent, cultured and

civilized beings whom the first Europeans found in Mexico, Peru and elsewhere. All of this must have required thousands of years of life in the environment to which they had fitted themselves."

Dr. Bruce Russell of Cincinnati has discovered relics of an ancient civilization in caverns on the Nevada-California line and writes: "The men are 8 and 9 feet tall. These giants are clothed in garments consisting of a medium length jacket and trousers extending below the knees. The texture of the material resembles sheepskin, but obviously it was taken from an animal unknown today. The relics have been estimated to be approximately eighty thousand years old." "There were giants on the earth, Genesis 6:4."

John Sargent, holding the degrees of Doctor of Science from Oxford and Ph.D. from Lima, Peru, and former leader of a scientific expedition to South America for the British Museum says: "A long list of facts has convinced me that man was living in South America some 200 thousand years ago."

Believe it or not, the statement that man must of necessity be brought from an Eden in the Old World is nothing more than the lingering echo of the 16th century.

Edgar Lee Hewitt writes: "To this race, lost in chasms of antiquity, the Old World did not exist. Their world was this isolated continent, its boundaries the sky and the seas which, so far as they were concerned, were equally limitless. It was their continent, their world, by right of occupation and long possession."

If it is found that the American Continent is geologically the oldest of all lands, and that it contains the remains of the most ancient forms of life found on our planet—if ethnologists seriously inform us that they have found proofs that American man is of an older vintage than Old World man—if antiquarians prove to us that Eastern Hemisphere cities discovered are no more than 7,000 years old, while a Bolivian city and stone carvings are twice that age—if the

Red Man is claimed to be the earliest type of man, an unmixed stock, shall we continue to regard this as the New World and the Amerind as an immigrant?

A million might say, "I don't know." To them the advice of the colored woman to her son would be good: "Lor chile, when yuh ain't got no eddication yuh jest got to use yo brains."

Surely we should wind up the debate of 400 years and "fess up" to the truth. A child might ask: "Where did the Amerind come from?" and receive the answer in Sunday School.

O peeled and hunted and reviled,
Sleep on, dark tenant of the wild!
Great Nature owns her simple child.
And who shall deem the spot unblest,
Where Nature's younger children rest
Lulled on their sorrowing mother's breast?

Whittier.

CHAPTER XIII

THE AMERIND: THE ONLY MAN ON EARTH
WHO IS NOT AN IMMIGRANT!

“Their memory liveth on your hills,
 Their baptism on your shore;
 Your everlasting rivers speak
 Their dialect of yore.”

Just who, then, is this copper-colored inhabitant of America who has such a lengthy and unbroken lineage, going back to the day-dawn?

He is a specimen of the original man, a contemporary of the earliest types that have now been dust for these thousands of years. He is the last remaining original man upon the earth with posterity still in circulation. He is the strangest genus extant, literally a man who lived contemporaneously with the now extinct mammalia in a remote, secret, self-enclosed land of his own.

The Amerind, as he is now called, was the only pure-blood stock on earth, as there was no other race he knew of with whom he could mix. The lineage of the Indian, therefore, is very much older than that of any other family group of peoples on the earth today. His very existence was unknown to the rest of mankind until he appeared on the world's stage in 1492 A.D., when his discovery bridged the ages.

If “possession is nine points of the law,” this land belongs to the Indian, as he has owned it since the beginning. No alien race having ever trodden his soil until the Spaniards arrived. The outer world had never even touched the edges of their isolated terrain. The restless seas on each side of them had been as void of sails as at creation's morn. It was as though they lived on another plane of existence.

In his own individual world, the Red Man lived and loved, and dreamed and died in profound isolation. He conceived of his gods and built dwelling places for them in his own distinctive manner. No foreign influence touched him. The works of his hands are now largely mounds of the dead. The architects have passed on.

Undisturbed and even uninfluenced by the ebb and flow of the races on the other side of the world, the Amerind lived on his original soil in unbroken possession thereof, and with lineage unmixed since his advent on God's footstool. He alone of all men is autochthonous! America was his habitat, and it will yet be discerned and admitted that the only man on this planet who is not an "immigrant" from somewhere is the American Indian!

The Red Indian is, therefore, one hundred per cent AMERICAN! It was here that he was engendered; and culturally he is independent of the old world.

While every other race is many-sourced, the Red Man is *himself*—as distinct from any other tribe as the Negro or the Mongolian.

Our contention is that he is another species, created in a different environment from others.

The Amerind remained in the back-waters of the stream.

The ebb and flow of the great sea of life running through Europe and Asia and overflowing into northern Africa never touched him.

He was the only really "self-made" man; and, as we have seen, he made a pretty good job of it!

We see the so-called ancient people of the Old World migrating to new lands; the Chinese establishing the Celestian Empire; the Egyptians entering the Nile Valley; the Aryans settling on the plains of India; the Japanese colonizing the islands of the Rising Sun; the Jews taking possession of Palestine; and all of them first ousting the original inhabitants.

Egypt, occupying the centre of the earth became the focal point of many civilizations. Its knowledge was supple-

mented and enlarged by intercourse with all other countries, as they lived at the "cross-roads" of the ancient world. Nations rose and fell, but always something was attained, and Old World people rose, little by little.

In the course of ages, Europe, Asia and Africa traded and intermixed with each other. Nations rose and fell. Were sold into slavery and were scattered by wars.

Recorded history—which only goes back for 6,000 years—shows a state of perpetual unrest in the eastern hemisphere.

So as Julian Huxley writes: "All these human groups are of decidedly mixed origin." An assortment of races which even the League of Nations could not classify. Truly a *mélange* of peoples.

But in the case of the Red Man, we find that he has been permanently settled in his own land for thousands of years. No other race has occupied any one country for so lengthy a period as the Indian.

The ancient land of China only claims a history extending back to 1122 B.C.

But through all the changing scenes of the Old World, the sunset people of the western half remained a race apart—their very *existence* unguessed! They were an unknown land, working out their own destiny until 1492.

Did it ever occur to the reader to note that the Japanese people at that date were still unknown to Europeans, and probably to the Chinese, as were the American Indians to us? No European ship had ever visited the land of the Rising Sun, perhaps none had seen one of its inhabitants.

Before the last Ice Age scooped out the Nile Valley and covered it with a fertile soil (thus making it habitable for the settlers we now call "Egyptians"), the Amerind lived here in the land of the evening.

In his *The Rise of Civilization*, Dr. Breasted has to bring settlers into Egypt before he builds up their culture. Diodorus Sicules, a Greek historian of the first century B.C., writes: "The Egyptians themselves claimed that their an-

cestors were strangers who settled on the banks of the Nile."

The Red Men have no such history, nor can they be traced to any other land. The country we now call "America" has been their habitat from the dawn of the ages. The Amerind an immigrant? Emphatically NO. The rest of mankind immigrants? History cries out "Yes!"

Amerind bones were deeply interred in the soil of this western world prior to the time when the first barqueful of settlers stepped onto the land to be later known as "Egypt."

If such lengthy residence here as that does not make him an "American," and effectually take away from him any tinge of Asia, it will be a long time yet before "John Alden" and the rest of the "Mayflower" voyagers are entitled to their "First Papers"—to say nothing of their "Second" ones!

But the Amerind's history, which doubtless began when man first appeared on the world's stage, was thenceforth to be ended, for now he is naught but a cipher.

How this pioneer Red Man started life as an autochthonous human, in an insular world of his own, whether through some process of evolution or by direct creation, each in his own tongue must answer. When? Presumably at the time that the Creator caused man to appear elsewhere. This view is weighted by a preponderance of likelihood.

All that we do know for sure is that he was here when the earliest known man roamed the forests of the Old World.

Much is written in these days of Palestine being the national home of the Jewish people. Mesopotamia is supposed to have been their first home, though as we saw in our chapter on Eden, eight other races shared it with them.

Ararat was their second. Ararat we are told means "The plains of the Aryans," so when they left the Ark and came down into the lowlands it would seem that natives had preceded them even there.

Jerusalem was the "Salem" of the Canaanites before the Israelites captured it. The student of Scripture reads of many nations that preceded them. The Israelites had to conquer the land just as we took America from its original owners. Clearly the Hebrew is not the real native of Palestine—just as he is not an Egyptian, though he lived in the latter country for 800 years. If people would stop to think they would think to stop stating such arrant absurdities.

No other race upon this planet are so emphatically the rightful owners of their land as is the Red Man to this one! This is profoundly and significantly true.

The poignant tragedy of it is that this man should for 400 years have been regarded as an importation, when in reality he is the only man ever discovered still living on his own original demesne, and therefore unique in being the *only man on earth who is not an immigrant*.

In the words of the poet:

"Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said
This is my own, my native land."

That is what the "Amerind" had been thinking and saying right along.

Belated though the time may be, let us recognize the Amerind for what he is; he has long resented the implication that he is an importation. The decision is long overdue.

It is with these distinctive people of "America" (as their land is now called) that this treatise is concerned.

It is encouraging to observe that scientists, in increasing numbers in every land, are now conceding to the Indian his own birthright. He is coming into his own.

In a short while we believe scientists will become bold enough to throw off the inherited shackles altogether and admit unhesitatingly that the Amerind *belongs here*.

This long-deferred acknowledgment may be near.

No biologist would "lose face," but rather gain glory

by admitting this. It costs something to be somebody. And somebody should not always lag behind the more up to date ones.

The evidences are too numerous and too compelling for us to deny to the Amerind his true ethnological niche. Why shrink from facts of history and cling to ideas now obsolete?

Strange that some, even today, need to be reminded that "the world does move." Why continue living in the 16th century?

The diligent student of ethnology will not find any modern book which does not at least throw doubts on the old "immigration" idea brought in to account for the presence here of the Amerind.

For instance the *Source Book* states: "They are now believed to be of a distinct race, and are not thought to be derived from any eastern peoples. For many, many centuries the American Continent has been the home of the race."

We venture the statement that no man who has ever lived among the Amerinds and who also knows the smirking, obsequious manner of the Oriental, could ever for a moment think that the sullen, haughty, proud, aloof, austere bearing of the Red Man did not differentiate these as being two distinct and separate races.

Between the volatile, chattering Asiatic and the phlegmatic, quiet Amerind there is a whole world of contrast. They are complete opposites.

The Red Man, notwithstanding all the old fables as to his source, today stands out distinctly as a *separate race*. He was not earmarked by the Church to all eternity.

In the face of the many discoveries herein referred to, can we—*dare we*—regard the Amerind as an "immigrant?" It is not a scientific viewpoint to hold today. With all the illuminating data of the last 400 years at our disposal, a re-statement is urgently called for.

With the knowledge now in our possession, the theory becomes as obsolete as the maps of feudal times which

indicate China as being on the Island of Newfoundland.

In 1492 A.D. an entirely new race of beings was revealed to an astonished not to say astounded world; a tribe until that time known only to God—the strangest and most perplexing of all the people of the earth, and it had required many millenniums of isolation from other branches of the human family to evolve anything so unique.

Professor Alexander of the University of Nebraska writes: "The native peoples of the New World show a oneness of race nowhere else to be found over so great an area. A certain racial character, typical of all American Indians shows long isolation from the balance of mankind."

There seems to be abundant evidence to show that even the savage tribes of the southern forests are now in a state of "devolution" (if we may use this word in the sense of the opposite of "evolution"). What we today call "virgin" jungle really covers ruined cities that once throbbed with life in civilized form.

Poor fallen creatures now occupy halls of cultured splendor in Mexico. They have dropped into darkness. They walk through lives which long ago ceased to mean much, even to themselves—living ghosts of a past.

Human bodies can live on when the light of the mind has gone out. As has been hinted, "devolution" may be surer and more ruthless than "evolution."

Happy are those who reach out for something beyond their own poor human lives.

In this connection we quote Max Muller: "What do we know of savage tribes beyond the last chapter of their history? Do we ever get an insight into their antecedents? Unless we admit a special creation for these savages, they must be as old as we ourselves. They may have passed through ever so many vicissitudes, and what we consider "primitive" may be, for all we know, a relapse into savagery."

We of "yesterday" can never come down (or up) to him; and he can never come up (or down) to us. Con-

genitally he is a different being from ourselves. We know no more of them than Columbus did and that was nothing.

We the extremely youthful (by comparison), boastful, red-blooded but *not* Red-skinned "Americans" of today are many, many centuries and degrees removed from the ancient aborigines of this land, who are a holdover from Father Time.

The Amerind stands apart, primitive, enigmatical, baffling, veiled in mystery. His music cannot even be written in our method of notation! To another era truly does he belong, and by the sheer weight of his years he is doomed to extinction. He cannot be "assimilated."

Let us, therefore, at least give him credit for his descent and his ascent. From his very natal hour, he climbed, unaided and alone, and climbed high. He was wise with the mysticism of antiquity. He is, one might almost say, infinitely old.

Looking back through the thickening mists of the centuries we see this bronze race as being virile and polished while the Caucasian was still sunk in barbarism.

In the years behind the years, back in the morning of the world, the Amerind had his day, but it is now wrapped in layer upon layer of *centuries*.

In those far-off days the "Midnight Sea" bisected the Globe. When the rushing stream of European gold-seekers was turned westward, the Amerind was doomed. He was drowned. He was dashed upon the rocks. He was washed up on the land and left like expiring fish on muddy banks after an inundation!

The Amerind is an anomaly in his genesis, his secluded life, his achievements, and his color. These stand out strikingly distinct in the mosaic of humanity. There are no other humans with attributes like him. These racial peculiarities were stereotyped thousands of years ago.

The "Great Artist" who brushed the metallic sheen onto the American butterfly's wings and painted the matchless colors of its birds, likewise tinted the Amerind's skin with

different pigment from what He had used on the rest of His creation.

The American man was made from another "mold" by a Power older than all the ages; and this accounts for the baffling impression one gets of utter unfamiliarity, and the lack of any basis for comparison with other races.

Is it cause for wonder that they are incomprehensible to the Caucasian? No bridge can span the gulf that separates these human souls from us. After four centuries of white contact he remains as aloof and mysterious as ever.

Can primeval man be expected to blend with the "pot-pourri" of people we call the "white race" of today? The Red Man belongs to a different section of the human family.

The Amerinds lived to another "rhythm." They can never tune in to the "wave-length" of a younger (and jazzier) world.

The Red Man's nature is not attuned to the "tempo" of the white man.

The distance between them and ourselves is as the distance between us and the stars!

Most of them have melted back into the eternal stillness whence they came. Nothing can be done about it. It is a matter of survival.

Those who still linger with us are but the ghosts of those that have passed on—their eyepits red with the rust of centuries of tears. A sense of futility has been beaten into them. They have no more illusions.

To quote a popular newspaper caption, this for the Amerind is the time "when a feller needs a friend"—and that is the reason for this book being written by proxy. Owing to the lapse of time and the vandalisms of the white man, the Indians' written records have been lost.

From his natal hour he has been a segregated creature, a being apart. There never has been a race resembling him, either in appearance or civilization.

It has been natural to ask who he was.

But is his presence here any greater mystery than the

presence of man anywhere? Why should it be so considered?

The manner in which God makes things come to pass is to us inscrutable, and we can but leave the process to Him.

If we question how man came to be here, we might in the same breath and with equal propriety ask how such abundant animal-life came to exist in America.

Our only answer must be that—farther back in the ages than man's imagination can reach, there was life in this half of the world as well as in the other half. The Life Spirit brooded here as well as elsewhere.

The Creator is timeless and spaceless.

In God's own mysterious way and His own mysterious past, He breathed and the Amerind lived. He is a rare copy of a "First Edition!"

He spent his natal day on American soil—away back in the Springtime of the world. For ages uncountable he lived and still lives upon another plane of existence, forever foreign in atmosphere.

As we turn the rocky "pages" of the earth's crust and examine the records of human life upon this hemisphere, we note "sealed in the iron hills" the first dawning consciousness in the ancient inhabitants.

They chipped their flints; imagined and then invented their bows and arrows. Such gradual climb is clearly shown in the *American Book of the Earth*, and he who runs may read the whole story of their evolution. The Amerind commenced his "humanity" here from the cave. When we see his first artifacts we know that he must have been as low as the lowest Old World man.

However, there was latent in him the capacity to build the "Temple of a Thousand Columns," but the bowed head of the flint-worker dreamed of no such marvel at that time. Millenniums were to elapse ere the American man created his pyramids and invented his calendar. The *Book of the Earth* tells the story.

We feel sure that research work in the Americas such

as has been done in Egypt would disclose amazing antiquities.

Whilst we have abundant evidence that man is as old upon this continent as he is on any other, there seems to have been a slower awakening to his birthright. In very truth he was obliged to "work out his own salvation," and thus naturally fell behind the ever-advancing column of the human race.

It would seem that the northern Indians never rose to the heights attained by their southern kinsmen.

Whether to regard them as being wanderers from the more civilized peoples of the south, or as the original stock wherefrom the Mayas and Aztecs had come, scientists for a long time speculated.

Gallatin thinks it most probable that civilization commenced in the South and spread toward the North.

Let us put the findings of savants together and see in what direction they point.

First then we have scientists asserting that all animal life originated in Patagonia. Patagonia is the farthest point in the Americas from the nearest point in Asia—a distance almost from Pole to Pole.

Secondly, the prepondering populations were found south of North America which had few aborigines.

Thirdly, in North America, which is closest to Asia, comparatively few Amerinds were found, and in the regions nearest to Asia none were found. So Professor Alexander of the University of Nebraska very correctly is emphatic in asserting that populations flowed northward and not southward.

How does this seem to agree with the propagated fantasy that man and animals journeyed south from Siberia?

Even today, nearly 300 years after its discovery, Alaska can boast of only 73 thousand inhabitants in all its much more than half a million square miles.

Common sense would argue that if they had come from the north that would be the most thickly populated and

most advanced portion of their new land. It was just the reverse.

In the history of mankind there has always been the home-loving flock like Jacob's and the more restless wanderers like Esau.

Glorious Greece and Rome existed in the same Europe as the piratical Norsemen, and North America is twice the size of Europe.

In the North they were assiduous fishers. They carved the records of their ancestry on high "Totem Poles." They were mighty hunters on the plains. They builded wonderful apartment houses, some containing hundreds of rooms, in the South. In Mexico they evolved into builders of cities probably larger than any in the Old World of corresponding dates. And in the South they rose to what Fay Cooper describes as a "truly high civilization." In Peru we find "the world's oldest city,—a monolithic "enigma."

Whoever built the Cyclopean fortress near Cuzco—than which no greater work was ever attempted in the east—showed marvellous intelligence, as its designs have been copied by European Governments.

Those ruins speak across immensities of time.

Among the 50 million? attributed by some to pre-Columbian America, by far the greater number lived south of what is now known as "Texas." A word corrupted from the Spanish *tejedor* "weaver," for there the Indians wove blankets.

Mayan cities were larger than were Chinese cities of corresponding age, and they were the most populous of ancient times.

Dr. Morley tells us that Central America was once the most thickly-populated area on the globe.

It is a well-known fact that the old Castilians did not voyage to America to colonize the land but to exploit the Indians.

Did it ever occur to the reader to note that before the early Spaniards found room for colonization they had to

kill off most of the original inhabitants? Such was also the case, though to a lesser extent on the northern continent.

Does not history tell us that the "Pilgrim Fathers" bought their land from the first Americans? *They* were the "*First Families!*" Today, however, they (the survivors) are not "citizens" nor are they "aliens." The Amerind is the real "man without a country." His world has been taken from him. His motherland is now a step-mother's land.

All the wonderful story of colonization, step by step, reveals the white man entering as the Indian receded. In some cases it was because the Indians melted away from diseases introduced by the "Pale Face," or from consuming the white man's liquor. In most cases, however, we must admit that it was due to the settlers' bullets! The Red Men have always been known to be a brave people. Relentlessly they fought against the encroachments of the "Pale Face," but always on their own ground. For three centuries the painted warriors struggled desperately to stay the oncoming of the white man, and they played their part with power and nobility. The stories of their courage and devotion shall live on.

Should we not be magnanimous enough to give our high school students a translation of Chief Logan's sublime message to Lord Dunferm? Thomas Jefferson is authority for the statement that in all of the orations of Demosthenes or Cicero there is nothing superior. "My Country" was Logan's country. The "Land of the Pilgrims' 'pride'" was *first* the *Indians'* land!

Much of American history should be rewritten, many readjustments of thought should be made.

It is an oft-repeated boast that tyranny has never thrived on American soil; but it is seldom recalled that the first battles for freedom in this land were fought by the Red nation!

Irvin S. Cobb writes: "Since the republic was formed we have deliberately broken 264 separate treaties with the

original Red owners of this land. From these violation of our solemn promises, border wars frequently ensued. When the Indians started fighting we called it an uprising. When we sent troops forth to slaughter the Indians, it was a punitive expedition to restore law and order. If the white soldiers wiped out the Indians that was a battle. If the Indians wiped out the soldiers that was a massacre. Those who make history rarely get a square deal from those who write history."

Let us bear in mind that it is hard for one to do an enemy justice, and the historian of the Indian is the one who was his oppressor. His destroyer obliterated him—and then wrote the story of his life! An *Indian* historian would write the other side; but the Red Man remains largely inarticulate.

The United States Government records show that many of the Indian leaders were equal, mentally, to the white Generals sent against them. There is no room for controversy on this subject. We would simply point out that the Americas have been occupied by Europeans only in proportion as they were evacuated of the aborigines.

What happened to the Indian was inevitable. A people still living in the Stone Age could not withhold a vast continent from the uses of civilization. When the sun rose upon the first band of white men, night was at hand for the red, and slowly the shadows closed round them. Yet, as Wissler, the noted anthropologist, has pointed out, they are "the source of the most original traits of our present-day culture and a heritage upon which we may realize more and more."

The glamor of his past is gone. It was not that sort of glamor shown in "Wild West" shows or the still "wilder" moving pictures wherein so many Injuns per minute "bite the dust" to the accompaniment of cheers or howls from the young folks at the matinee; but the settled orderly life of the strangest and most romantic people under the sun. They are wise with the wisdom of a lengthy past, which has

taught them dignity and the worthlessness of much of what seems to newer people to be so eminently desirable.

The great Republic of the North, after killing off most of the aborigines, finally allotted to the remnant certain lands as "Reservations." They are now permitted to live, if they can, under the changed conditions. They are regarded as "dodos"—but still existing, we do not know why. A species of strange living human fossils.

Today we think so little of him that O. Henry once said: "Indian—a member of a race to which we owe nothing except the land on which the United States is situated." He is now a disinherited man, a grunt in a blanket.

He has survived, physically at least, as difficult a test as any race has ever survived; and the fact that, instead of dying out, as seemed likely not long ago, Indians are now increasing in the United States and are evidently destined to be a permanent factor in our national life.

But do we owe him nothing? And is he increasing? Millions of white men in South America have married Indian women. Many thousands of white men in North America have done the same. It can be shown the Indian of pure blood is certainly decreasing in numbers.

We salute a dying race—helpless, inarticulate, forgotten without any discernable future.

There are those who would tell us that the Indian population is increasing, but the fact that they are intermarrying with the whites to a greater degree than formerly is the reason for the apparent growth.

Henry Daly said: "It is an error to assume that because of their ignorance of the ways of civilization they were of a child-like order of intelligence, and that their feats of war were due mainly to superior physical endurance. Most of the Indian leaders we have ever known or observed were the equals mentally of the white leaders with whom they dealt, and as frequently as otherwise they were superior. This statement applies to the old time Indian in his semi-primitive state. One of the mysteries of life to us is the way

civilization has blunted the intelligence of the Indian." Repression has atrophied his natural powers. It is said that Pontiac could have been at the head of any race in any age.

Some of these aborigines have become our foremost citizens, and strange as it may seem, now that most of them have been killed off, the pride of American aristocracy boast of their Indian blood! and we are raising our Boy Scouts on the memory of them.

President Wilson, of all men the most aristocratic, married a lady who boasted of her descent from Pocahontas.

The "bluest" blood of all Spain married the daughters of King Atahualpa, the Peruvian monarch. It is admitted that the wisest president Mexico ever had was Benito Juarez, a pure Aztec Indian, and our former Vice President Curtis was of Indian descent.

Herbert Sass in his work *Children of the Evening* writes: "Suddenly on the southwestern plains bordering Mexico a new kind of animal had appeared, an animal which the Indians had never seen before. It was the horse, brought to this continent by Cortez, De Sota and other early Spanish explorers. Running wild and increasing with astonishing rapidity, the horse transformed the Western Indians from plodding footmen into magnificent riders, so that by the time the white American frontier reached the prairies the western red men had become perhaps the finest barbaric cavalry in the world, for many an Indian literally gave his kingdom for a horse. The Red Warriors were probably the ablest savage fighters that the white race has even encountered, not excepting even the Zulus and the Maoris.

No civilized soldiery up to that time had learned so well to take advantage of environment, to utilize invisibility and secrecy, to capitalize the element of surprise, to make the most of fear-inspiring mystery. The general belief is that most of the early battles were fought by small bodies of white troops against hordes of Indians. The opposite is nearer the truth. Thus Braddock's British regulars, in-

vincible in Europe, were routed and practically destroyed by a smaller force of Indians, and the same thing is true of Grant's defeat a few years later. Their horsemanship became the wonder of the world."

It is not sentimentality but scientific fact that those who think of all Indians as being brutish animal-like savages are just as far wrong as those who have idealized the Red Man.

The Indians were generous people. History tells us that when the Pilgrims landed "they were hungry and in distress, and the Indians received them with open arms, and fed them with maize and other food, which they brought to them."

General Clark, in his declining days, said: "We visited two hundred thousand of these people and they everywhere treated us with hospitality and kindness."

When the Red Man was first discovered, Columbus wrote to the King and Queen of Spain—"So tractable, so peaceable, are these people, that I swear to Your Majesties that there is not in the world a better nation."

"They were a kindly and affectionate people," Hewitt says, describing the home life of the Iroquois, "full of keen sympathy for kin and friends in distress, kind and deferential to their women, exceedingly fond of their children."

Self-controlled as he was, to a remarkable extent, in the face of danger and suffering, the Indian was strongly emotional.

The belief in a "Great Spirit" was universal. They held that they had been created by that Spirit, and throughout life they rendered Him worship. After life's end they believed they would go to the "Happy Hunting Grounds."

Their conception of God was as high as the New Testament statement that "God is love," for they considered the Great Spirit as being endowed with so much goodness that He would not even take vengeance on His enemies. They held that the weakest of the gods would not be weak enough to blame anyone.

However, as John Hay puts it, "He ain't no saint." He is a poor, sinful creature like the rest of us.

The Indian was extremely ethical. No door-locks or bars existed in the whole land! His innate honesty was remarkable.

The great majority of the Indians of both North America and South America are still pagans. Our God as seen through us does not seem to commend Himself to them as being superior to their own. When the prophet of old wrote: "They shall see the glory of the Lord and the excellency of our God" he most assuredly was not referring to the Amerinds!

The character of our color, alas, is not the color of our character.

We stated that the Indians are still pagans. At the World's Fair in Chicago, a girl in the Indian Village was picked as the "Beauty Queen," but her photographs do not reveal her as showing her teeth, her legs, and most of her epidermis. Then how can she be a "Beauty Queen?" So the Indians are also still uncivilized!

As Lewis Spence says: "The noble, manly and dignified race has been grossly maligned."

The independent origin of the American languages gives to the race its prime and greatest claim to be regarded as truly autochthonous.

Enock—in *Mexico*—remarks: "None of the numerous indigenous tongues of the aborigines bear any resemblance to Asiatic tongues."

Bancroft states that "A relationship exists among all the tongues of the northern and southern continents . . . distinguishable from the speech of all the other races of the world."

"No theories of derivation from the Old World have stood the test of gramatical construction." Hayden.

"No authentic trace of any Old World language thus far has been found." Dallenbaugh.

We quote from the *Standard Cyclopedia*, "The unity of

the American language type is exactly matched by the essential unity and sameness of the mental, moral and physical types of the Red Man. Whatever accessions may have come, they were probably absorbed or lost in the original population."

If an influx of half-human wanderers arrived in America from anywhere, it was before "*homo sapiens*" was able to articulate. It is doubtful if paleolithic man could speak.

They must have learned the art of speech since their advent for we are informed by the *People's Cyclopedia* that "The native American languages show no affinity to any other tongues, but belong to an absolutely distinct order of speech."

Baldwin assures us that "The language of the American Indian throws no light upon his origin except that the origin was so far remote that all attempts, by this clue, to establish a common center of human creation are utterly futile."

In *North America*, Russell writes: "As the American languages have no affinity with the Teutonic or Semitic stocks, it is evident that the source or sources from which they came far antedate the birth of the oldest people of which history takes cognizance. Man must, therefore, have been on American soil before the sprouting of the linguistic twig."

It may have been in some American language that Adam introduced himself to Eve—in the words "Madam, I'm Adam!"

Since the culture, the language, the mode of writing, the physiognomy and the color of this "bronze man" of America are found to be so radically different from those of the Oriental, why forever insist that he originated in the Orient? Is it not permissible to doubt such a statement? In this book we seek to show that the phrase, so frequently and thoughtlessly used, is nothing but words.

The following are a few of the phrases by which various writers describe him.

As Pope said: "The proper study of mankind is man."

"The Red Man of America is the most self-contained of all people"; "The purest of all racial strains"; "The difference is profound"; "The alliance is unnatural"; "Their very method of thought is different"; "They cannot be fused with any other people"; "Remarkably distinguished from the inhabitants of the Old World"; "The Amerind is curiously unlike any other"; "A more uniform character than is found among the nations of any other quarter of the globe"; "Different from the ordinary run of mankind"; "A kin to none, inscrutable"; "Something unmistakably of another kidney about him"; "A puzzle to which there is no solution"; "A strange aura of other-worldness envelopes them"; "Spiritually he is as alien to the white man's ways of thought as he is to the Asiatic"; "Outlandish and unreadable." "We are unable to catalogue them." How can they be catalogued when their early contemporaries in the eastern hemisphere have been dust for thousands of years? The Amerind is somebody nobody knows.

Along with countless other immigrants from every land under the sun, we sing with thoughtless complacency "My Country, 'tis of thee!" just as though this western world had been created for our especial benefit! The *true "American"* is relegated to the scrap heap! He is just a cipher now. The Countenance of his Manito is hidden behind a thick cloud.

Paradoxically, when the Amerind was *found*, he was *lost*. Through mistaken classification his very identity was blotted out. It is with that misunderstood race this book is concerned.

The irony of the matter is that the *only man ever found dwelling on his own original inheritance had to be dubbed an immigrant from another land!*

And now we shall see how these men, discovered in a theretofore unknown portion of the globe, lived in their various countries in the South.

MEXICO

On Aztec ruins, gray and lone,
The circling serpent coils in stone —
Type of the endless and unknown;
Whereof we seek the clue to find,
With groping fingers of the blind!
Forever sought, and never found
We trace that serpent-symbol round
Our resting-place, our starting bound!
Oh thriftlessness of dream and guess!
Oh wisdom that is foolishness!
Why idly seek from outward things
The answer inward silence brings?

Whittier.

CHAPTER XIV

MEXICO

"'Tis good to muse on nations passed away
Forever from the land we call our own."

The Spaniards found these Amerinds living in all stages of development. Some were in the Stone Age, as some tribes recently visited by the author in Brazil still are. Others had evolved into the Bronze Age.

In Mexico they were living in a degree of civilization higher than that of some of the people of Europe at that time, and undoubtedly more advanced than that of some of the eastern nations in 1500 A.D.

On the 8th of November 1519 A.D. the Conquistadores, under Cortez, first beheld Tenochtitlan, the capital of the Aztec Federation, which has been described thus: "A beautiful city with strange buildings, above which rose great pyramids with sanctuaries upon their summits. So rose those towers, and lived and moved the dwellers in this lake city, unknowing and unknown of European men; living their life as if no other world than theirs held sway beneath the firmament of the Unknown God."

Tenochtitlan (now called "Mexico City") has a population of nearly one million. Today it is described as a "a city part Seville and part Atlantis." In 1500 A.D. it was quite a metropolis for that age. The Spanish adventurers state that for four successive leagues there was a continuous line of houses. The lowest estimate of its population as given by the various chroniclers was 300,000; and Cortez, the Conquistador, describes it as "the most beautiful thing in the world."

When we bear it in mind that Old London at that time

(according to Black's *London*), boasted a population of only 145,000, we see that the Aztec capital was no small city.

In his *Conquest of Mexico*, Prescott relates that a careful police force provided for the health and cleanliness of the city, and 1,000 persons are said to have been employed daily in watering and sweeping the streets "so that a man could walk through them with as little danger of soiling his feet as his hands." Read Charles Dickens to learn what muddy streets London had even in his day!

Although Tenochtitlan was a pagan city, it was lighted up at night from the tops of the temples, while the Christian cities of Europe were left in Stygian blackness; first, for the theological reason that "God divided the light from darkness," and secondly, because medical authorities declared that "night air is injurious to health"—so people were not to be encouraged to sally forth in the evenings!

The Aztec dynasty was much larger than the Spanish Kingdom, both in territory and population. King Montezuma lived in regal splendor. His castle and hanging-gardens at Chapultepec were probably equal to those in old Babylon. That immense cluster of buildings, covering many acres of ground, has been described by eye-witnesses as being larger and more beautiful than any edifice in Spain. The palace was supplied with numerous baths, and the King bathed every day. It is doubtful if any royal castle in Europe at that time had a bath-tub, and more than doubtful if any of the conquerors had ever seen one! It is recorded that their own Queen "boasted" of *two* baths—one at birth and the other at marriage!

Montezuma was considerably richer than was any European monarch. If the tables had been reversed and it had been the Aztecs who discovered Europe, there would have been no necessity for the king to pawn his jewels in order to provide funds for the expedition. As Bernal Diaz writes: "There were beautiful women and much loot."

While cholera and other epidemics raged intermittently

throughout the capitals of the Old World, the sanitary conditions and pure water-supply of Tenochtitlan made it a healthful city.

The founding of hospitals in Europe and the glorious work of Florence Nightingale have been attributed to the beneficial effects of Christianity; but the Spaniards attest the fact that hospitals were established in every city of Anahuac. Surgeons were placed in charge of these, and "they did not protract the cure in order to increase the pay."

And what can we later Americans say of the Aztec law which decreed that "a judge that receives presents or a bribe is to be punished with death?"

However, their State religion was barbaric in the extreme. Its bloody rites were devilish. In those matters they were at least a thousand years behind the times. While Zoroaster, Buddha, Confucius and Mohammed had purged the religions of the ancient East, the Aztec gods still cried out for blood.

Torquemada estimates that there were 40,000 temples in Mexico.

Tens of thousands of long-gowned priests were supported by the State. In the great storied "teocalli" at Tenochtitlan alone there were 5,000 clerics. These "confessed" and "absolved" all the sinners of the capital, the Conqueror tells us.

Like all the people of remote ages, the Aztecs were intensely religious. Kings and priests ruled jointly. The State and the Aztec established religion were one, and as in ancient Sumeria both claimed the very life-blood of the common folk.

The history of dynasties and of religions is a bloody record—rulers for the bodies of men on the earth, and priests for their souls and bodies, here and hereafter.

Whilst the men of Castile were reckless and lawless, they were at the same time intensely "Catholic," and their desire was to plant the crucifix in the sacred places of the Aztecs. The Indian "Keepers of the Faith" were vindic-

tive in the extreme against the newcomers, knowing well that if the foreign religion were once established, their day of graft and deception would be over. Religious fanaticism is not necessarily a sign of piety! All the Spaniards and the horses they captured had their hearts torn out and placed upon the back stone of sacrifice—up the flight of 340 steps, on the top of the “teocalli.”

If “the gods we worship write their names on our faces,” those priests of Huitzilopochtli must have been hideous to behold!

But for the terrible antagonism between the conflicting religions, it might not have been necessary for Cortez utterly to destroy the capital and sacrifice at least 100,000 lives in the eight-months siege.

In all the annals of legend and history there is no epic more soul-stirring than the defense of Tenochtitlan by Guatemoc, the Indian prince. Men with only “Stone-Age” arms faced steel, gunpowder and horses! But the Dons record that Boabdils Moors had been paltry fellows in comparison with that strange generation, the men of Anahuac. Sheer bravery in face of certain defeat will ever be lauded. Do you wonder that a magnificent statue of Guatemoc crowns the principal street of the present Mexican capital? Not a single statue of Cortez is to be found in all Mexico.

During that ever-memorable siege, the ground was carpeted by Indian bodies; but the Indians did not always yield. There were times when the Spaniards blundered, and when the Red Man’s audacity triumphed over the white man, and Cortez tasted the bitter dregs of despair. Prince Guatemoc had said “So long as one house in the city is free of the white men, I will defend it,” and his warriors, with obsidian knives and clubs, though reduced to haggard skeletons for lack of food, stormed at the tightening ring of steel and shrieked mockingly at every blow. Thousands of dead littered the streets, while the famishing Indians ate the bark of the trees. Time and again the weary Span-

iards offered terms; but the "Chief of Men," forward on a roof as arrogant in his golden mail as though the State were undiminished, hoarsely shouted his refusal of the generous terms which Marina the interpreter offered. "Say to Malitzin (Cortez) we want from him neither kindness nor mercy. If it please the gods to call us, we will die fighting." But the city on the lake was doomed. The end was in sight. The city fell. Guatemoc was captured. "Now I can do no more," said he, "so take that dagger from your belt and kill me. I have no desire to live longer." The struggle had lasted ninety-five days, and it was no *trench warfare*.

No torture could make Guatemoc reveal the secret of the treasure they had buried. Even while his feet were burning, his grim lips were sealed. A real "he-man!"

Could anything be more "humanly interesting" than the tale of the emergence of millions of people "out of nowhere into the here?" The bringing in of the "orphan" Amerind into the human family is "the most wondrous tale ever writ by the hand of man, by the side of which the fables of Araby seem dim—the story of a clash of worlds, the conquest of a new, of an isolated hemisphere."

We cannot but lament the downfall of the Aztec kingdom. They had risen to a considerable height. Europe might have learned much from them—though their religion was one of the bloodiest in all history. Such rites as they practiced had disappeared from the cults of the Old World centuries before. It was high time that there should be an end to their era and such barbarous gods be destroyed. In the fullness of time, their "judgment day" had arrived.

The mass of the Mexicans were soon to discover that their gods were superseded, though even to this day in isolated places and in secret ways these still have their worshippers. Mankind will yet banish all false gods—but not until we banish all false ideas concerning the true God, so that they may behold the difference. There's a God behind the gods.

The ignominious use to which had been put one of the small idols owned by the author was brought to our attention when we discovered one of our sons using it as a hammer to drive nails into a block of wood! The mills of the gods do grind, but they in turn are ground. The world does move—but in matters of religion the motion is sometimes scarcely perceptible.

The Aztecs recognized the existence of a Supreme Creator and Lord of the universe. In their prayers they addressed Him as "the God by Whom we live"—"The Omnipresent That knoweth all thoughts and giveth all gifts"—"without Whom man is nothing"—"the invisible, incorporeal, one God, of perfect perfection and purity" and "under Whose wings we find repose and a sure defence."

Then we have the royal chief Nezahualcoyolt saying: "Truly the gods which I adore, idols of stone and wood, speak not nor feel, neither could they fashion the beauty of the heavens—the sun, the moon and the stars. Some hidden, powerful and unknown God must be the Creator of the universe." So, like the Greeks of old, he raised a temple to "THE UNKNOWN GOD"—which contained no images.

They had exalted thoughts such as we have, yet they made and worshipped hideous gods and offered human sacrifices—grafting devilish weeds onto a lovely tree.

After noting that the Aztecs' religion was one of the most barbaric, it is gratifying to observe that in other respects the Mexican Amerinds were reaching higher. For instance, they had evolved a unique system of picture-writing, not even similar to that of any other people. Plates of gold covered with strange hieroglyphics were found in thousands stacked in the vaults of the temples. These plates were ruthlessly melted down by the Spaniards. The information they contained might have unraveled for us those skeins of mystery which are now (and will probably remain) unsolved and inexplicable.

The Aztecs had also invented a species of papyrus paper,

on which they kept records; and we read that the first Archbishop of Mexico collected from every quarter and piled up "in a mountain heap" thousands of painted manuscripts at Texuco and reduced them to ashes. A mountain of ignorance destroying a mountain of knowledge—one page of which would now be almost priceless!

If the finding of the new world was the *greatest* event in many respects of all time, it was likewise one of the most *painful* chapters of history. Bishops whose sole studies had been concerning the lives of the saints and a thousand traditions of the Church, exultantly made statements like that of the pious Bishop Landa: "We burnt them all (referring to the manuscripts) which the people wondrously regretted, and it gave them pain." Yes, Bishop, and it gives the world a great pain even to this day, and the pain will be eternal! Oh, the pity of it, the pity of it!

Archbishop Jimenes of Spain had similarly burnt all of the Arab records in Granada twenty years previously.

The Spanish conquerors thus ignorantly destroyed both the lock and the key which might have furnished us today with the answers to many of these vexed questions of ours.

The loss was irreparable. While the burning of a "Rembrandt" or "Titian" masterpiece is a matter of profound regret, such is negligible by comparison with the destruction of those records.

The tragedy of the discovery and conquest of America is that it occurred in an age when Europe was not sufficiently civilized to appreciate the importance of preserving the buildings and relics, and, above all, the writings of these pre-Columbian people.

Truly those were the "Dark Ages," wherein bands of illiterate adventurers could ruthlessly destroy palaces and temples and melt into nothingness these important racial records—believing that the gold was of more value than the information inscribed thereon!

In the light of these facts, we wonder if after all the

Spaniard was any more "civilized" than the uncivilized Aztec!

Since the dawn of time, so-called "religion" has contributed more than has any other one force to ignorant vandalism and even hatred of man for his "brother."

No wars have been more merciless than "religious" ones.

The author has seen soldiers stationed in the holiest of all places in Jerusalem for the purpose of keeping one sect from murdering another—and that well-nigh two thousand years after the "Prince of Peace" died for mankind there!

As Thomas Hardy pungently observes: "After 2,000 years of Mass, we've got as far as poison-gas!"

The culture of these Mexicans was unique. The ruins of the buildings show their builders to have had twists of mind indicative of unlikeness to the people of the Old World. The architecture is odd and the carvings are strange. Any similarity to what might be found elsewhere only goes to show that the Aztec was a human like the rest of men, and thus, naturally, his conceptions would run in human grooves. The dissimilarities are more pronounced than the similarities. His civilization was American; it was not borrowed from or amplified by any other culture. He had himself evolved what he possessed.

It is not within the province of this work to dwell upon the lives and characters of these aboriginal people; but in passing may we point to some of their attainments, and remark that they were higher—despite their isolation—than were some of the nations of the Old World that might reasonably have been expected to surpass them.

After the conquest of the Aztec kingdom, the Spaniards spread over their new realm in eager search for "El Dorado"—"the Gilded Man" of whom they had heard.

In their early writings we note a stray reference here and there to ruined cities which they came across and to old temples they ransacked; but it is not of record that they did much more than notice these ruined cities.

The Europe of 1500-1700 was not interested in archeology. Even the site of Pompeii—right in the heart of the Roman Empire—was quite forgotten and only discovered by accident as it were in 1689.

Many years were to pass and the belief that a new world had been discovered had had time to become deeply rooted and universally accepted, before it was learned that deep in the jungles of the recently-discovered land there were cities and temples of grandeur and art, whose ruins plainly indicate that they had been erected in the mystic youthtime of the world.

It has remained for one of our latest inventions, namely the aeroplane, to map out the great fields of northern Canada; while emerging as from the mists of prehistoric times, in Central and in South America are towns and cities which were buried and forgotten ages ago. *Four thousand* or more such archeological sites have been found. What will those mounds of tropical verdure reveal when America realizes that research-work (like charity) should begin "at home?" When some of the streams of gold are diverted from *eastern* explorations, the wondrous works of man in our land will be laid bare.

Lucien Biart in *The Aztecs* says: "Modern science has dispelled the illusion which ascribes an Egyptian, a European, or a Hindu origin to these people."

Notice comes to us of the remarkable finds made in Mexico indicative of buried cities which had taken untold centuries for construction and reconstruction—embalmed mummies—engraved stones—hieroglyphs apparently much older than and unrelated to "Maya Codices"—also gold and silver objects by the hundred.

We rejoice to know that the Carnegie Institute is planning to spend at least two million dollars in exploration work. The *People's Cyclopedia* writes: "Nothing has ever been found to indicate a relationship between the Amerind and any culture of the eastern hemisphere. The mummies unearthed are all in the conventional sitting position com-

mon to Amerindian burials. The engraved stones bear no similarity to any Old-World writing. Theirs was a strange and unknown scheme of life and ways." The same authority also says, "Nor is there anything in the religious, system of government, architecture and other arts of the native Americans by which they can be connected with corresponding systems of the East."

Prof. Cook of Yale writes: "The older idea that the primitive civilizations of Mexico and Peru were originated by colonists from eastern lands has gradually given way to a belief among archaeologists and ethnologists that the primitive civilizations of America were developed entirely on the American continent, and that there must have been a period of slow and gradual development—a period to be expressed in millenniums rather than in centuries."

Sir Arthur Keith feels that the pre-Columbian civilization of the New World "points to an antiquity far beyond that commonly accepted by ethnologists."

We do not know what race first gained the upward look, nor can we ever know. Much is problematical. All that we can affirm with certainty is that man is very old and in every clime he has been reaching upward to higher things.

The evidence indicates that he rose here as early as in any other land.

All culture did not originate on the Nile. A hobby can be ridden too far! As remarked by Trader Horn: "What's the use of going against truth?"

There is not the slightest evidence that these nations had come from any other part of the earth, or that they knew of the existence of any other continent. They believed themselves to be the only humans on earth, and viewed the Spaniards as being from some other planet!

In his *Prehistoric America*, Foster says: "We seek in vain for any analogies in art which would connect the civilization of this country with that of the old world. That art was not derived from a remote source. It was the outgrowth of a people domesticated to the soil."

"The American monuments are different from those of any other people, of a new order, and entirely and absolutely anomalous; they stand alone. The more we study them, the more we find it necessary to believe that the civilization they represent was originated in America. It did not come from the Old World. The original beginning may have been as old as Egypt, and it may have been earlier than Egypt. Whether earlier or later, it was original." (Baldwin, in *Ancient America*.)

There was a dawn to the history of these people who lived in the world's morning-time; but all we know is a little of the last chapter.

The one hidden key that opened up all the mystery of Egypt is lacking here—there is no "Rosetta Stone" of America!

The Aztecs had, some centuries before the arrival of the Spaniards, supplanted the "Toltecs," a much higher, but probably less warlike race. Evidence shows that the Toltec civilization was quite advanced. Perhaps about the time that the Huns were destroying the culture of Rome, the Aztecs swept upon the Toltecs. Fortunately it seems that the conquerors adopted many of their customs and enriched themselves in learning. Of the Toltecs we know but little. Their most imposing architecture seems to have been the various pyramids they left for us to gaze upon and wonder about. All have their "Holy of Holies" on the summit.

"The Toltec pyramid of Cholula is one of the greatest structures ever erected by human hands. Even now, in its ruined condition, it is 177 feet high, 1,400 ft. square at the base, twice as long as the great Pyramid of Cheops, and covers 44 acres. Cheops covers less than 13 acres. From one of these erections a Spaniard, named Toledo, took gold valued at \$4,450,249 in our money." *New American Cyclopedia*.

The pyramid of Kukalcan is over a hundred feet high, and according to Professor England would cost *thirty-two*

million dollars in our money if built today! It was reared unknown thousands of years ago.

In his *Conquest of Mexico*, Prescott tells us that "The pyramids and sacred structures are set squarely with the cardinal points of the compass. The paintings upon the walls reveal a state of art as high as that of Egypt and the colors are as clear and fresh as the day they were put on." Experts tell us that none of our much-vaunted sky-scrapers will stand for a hundred years! And our colors last scarcely one year!

Are we, as intelligent people, to believe that these ancient Toltecs, in some remote and mysterious past, and in some never-explained and never explainable way, migrated to Mexico from Asia, half a world away? That after reaching their new land, they had changed their physiognomy, their complexion, their language, their religion, their architecture, their mode of writing, and that they had even forgotten the land of their birth and the route by which they had left it? Such a case of national amnesia is unthinkable.

A temple builded to the sun,
 Along whose sombre altar stone
 Bronze, bleeding virgins have been strown
 Like leaves, when leaves are crisp and dun
 In ages ere the Sphinx was born,
 Or Babylon had birth or morn.

Joaquin Miller.

"We know the shrine is void," they say,
 The God is flown —
 Yet wreaths are on the Altar laid
 The Altar Stone
 Is black with fumes of sacrifice,
 Albeit He has fled our eyes.
 "For, it may be, if still we chant
 And tend the Shrine,

Some Deity on wandering wing
 May there incline;
 And, finding all in order meet,
 Stay while we worship at His feet."

Kipling.

CHAPTER XV

THE MAYAS

“The Greeks of America”

“Itza-ama, Ahpuch and Kukulcan
Where are you now that were loved of man?
The gentle Son of an Eastern Jew
Has made but forgotten names of you.”

Ages before Cortez and his hosts anchored their caravels in western waters, the jungle had closed over marble halls and painted temples erected by a race of aborigines whom we now know as the “Mayas.”

Central America was the homeland of these mysterious people.

In the *National Geographic Magazine*, Dr. Morley writes: “Here a magnificent civilization had been developed. Great cities had flourished. Lofty pyramid temples and splendid palaces of cut stone, spacious plazas and courts filled with elaborately-carved monuments of strange yet imposing dignity. Market-places, terraces, causeways, were to have been counted—not by tens and scores but by hundreds and thousands.”

Centuries before Remus and Romulus founded the mud-walled “City of the Seven Hills” and called it “Rome,” native Americans could have pointed with pride to the twin glories of Copan and Uxmal in the (misnamed) “New World,” which today bears a Roman name. We now tread the mosaic floors and glazed tiles of their courts and remark upon the fact of their superiority to any we have seen in Pompeii or Constantinople—now peopled only by shadows.

It is extremely doubtful if a lapidary in any age could fashion a necklace with more than one thousand polished

turquoises more exquisitely beautiful than the one recently discovered in Yucatan.

When the savages of Britain were eating one another, temples of magnificent proportions, pylons of imposing grandeur, were being reared in America! It is quite within the range of possibility that the Mayas were cultured while Egypt was still in the Stone Age.

Eminent scientists like Dr. Spinden of Harvard and others who have spent years in research work and study and whose findings are thus entitled to the highest credence are pointing out the greatness and glory of the ancient Amerinds. Dr. Spinden's many explorations and unique discoveries relating to Mayan culture show that these little-understood people rose higher than did any other race on the globe at that time—at least 700 years B.C.

Central America is strewn with ruins. Skeletons of crumbling, time-bleached shrines, temples of gods forgotten 15 centuries ago, are slowly yielding to attrition. Streets once a-throb with bustle and merriment are silent as the grave. There are many miles of green "graves" of mansions and public buildings buried beneath two thousand years of jungle-growth.

The tombs of unnamed kings and nobles are found everywhere.

Millenniums of settled-life preceded their one thousand years of Golden Age.

Behind that, in the deeper shadows of time, there had been longings and strivings, with a hundred clumsy attempts to rise.

The millions who once called this their homeland now sleep in the American dust whence they sprang.

Many of the ruined buildings, scarcely noticed by those who first saw them, probably are as old as anything in Egypt.

We of the Twentieth Century can but stand in wonderment as we gaze upon the marvellous things left by the Red Man. Truly there were giants in those days.

Whatever his breed or color, the Amerind rose as high as any other people of his time.

Could a similarly-isolated European race have risen any higher?

They were far ahead of India, Japan or China although those lands enjoyed intercourse with the entire eastern world.

In their Palenque Beaux Reliefs, and in their wonderful Calendar, we have two deathless reminders of their artistic and of their scientific culture.

Whilst we do not concur with Colonel Galindo, the eminent archeologist, who pronounced Central America to be "the true cradle of civilization"—as there have been *many* such—nevertheless we doubt greatly if any "cradle" in any land of ancient times rocked more illustrious sons.

Gregory Mason states that "The early culture of the western hemisphere was in important respects higher than that of the so-called Old World. In archeological ornament, it was as great as the world has ever seen or will see." And Lewis Spence describes it thus—"A civilization by no means inferior to that of Egypt."

"Considering the absence of all connection with the most advanced portion of the human family in the eastern hemisphere, their progress in unaided self-development from the savage state must be accounted remarkable." *Ancient Society*, by Morgan.

Professor Ramon Mena, Curator of the Department of Archeology for the Mexican Government, announced that every article found in the ruins of Palenque was more than 10,000 years old; that the inhabitants were using stucco 10,000 years ago; and that, therefore, we can state confidently that there were people inhabiting the Valley of Mexico 8,000 years B.C.

The arrogance of the 20th Century is stilled in wonderment and admiration at the magnitude and magnificence of these buildings, and at the thought of the mighty men that

must have been their designers. Dupaix states that "With lavish magnificence they combine the solidity of the works of Egypt with the elegance of Greece." And Charnay says that "The work is equal to the finest of the Egyptians."

These mysterious ruins of the past are generally superior in development in proportion as they are anterior in age!

What shall be said of Chitzen-Itza, the sacred metropolis of the Mayas? It was a city that covered 12 square miles, and is considered by Dr. Morley to have been the home of 500,000 people! Miles of ruined palaces and religious edifices attest the fact that there had once been there a city throbbing with life and activity. Hawthorne says: "The ruins are an enigma compared with which the archeological problems of the Old World are an open book."

Four leagues of buildings erected by all-American workmen at a time when Europe was in a state of savagery! Carvings depicting those ancient people dressed in splendor while our forefathers put paint on their bodies and let that suffice! To quote a high authority in such matters: "The Temple of the Warriors was a work of skill and importance seldom equalled in archeological history, even in Egypt, Greece or Rome." Again—"The sculptured architecture which the Mayas made with stone implements has never been surpassed by a European working with chisels of iron." Charnay has stated that "The monuments of Greece and Rome, at their best time, can alone compare with the splendor of this great edifice. In their details they would compare favorably with our proudest monuments."

Chitzen-Itza was built by men who were no less brilliant than the American of today. The edifices were conceived and executed by men of superior talent, who lived in a golden age when men walked with the gods, who taught them that "man does not live by bread alone." In their own way, they climbed the world's great altar stairs. Theodore A. Willard writes: "They rivalled the culture of Egypt."

A palace now known as "Las Monjas"—which Moors or Hindus never surpassed in beauty, and with mural paint-

ings still visible, stands out in stately grandeur, and its serpent columns are unique in the entire world.

Le Plongeon claims that some of the edifices of Chitzen-Itza date back over 11,000 years. Granted that these dates seem excessive to some savants and fantastic to others, the fact still remains that they seem to be as ancient as any buildings in any other part of the world.

It must have taken many, many centuries of slow climbing before the Amerind could build the Pyramid of the Sun—an edifice 216 ft. high and 761 ft. at the base, constructed in a manner highly typical of a civilized race—erected perhaps 4,000 years ago as an abode for his god.

Picture the great seven-terraced pyramid with its 365 steps leading to the summit; the width of the stairs two feet greater at the top than at the bottom—thus giving to the eye the illusion of parallel lines. The marvellous Grecian architects were inspired with the same thought. Somehow the very splendor has tended to discredit its being American.

Is man wholly educated who has heard of the aqueducts of the Romans, but who has never heard of the greater aqueducts of the Amerinds. "The more we study the prehistoric ruins of America," has declared one of the leading ethnological scholars of the world, in the School of Archeology at Rome, "the more undecided we become whether the civilization of the Orient preceded that of America or that of America preceded the Orient."

To quote Lewis Spence once more: "The advance in civilization attained by the peoples of America must be regarded as among the most striking phenomena in the history of mankind, especially if it be viewed as attained by isolated races occupying a peculiar environment. An absorbing chapter in the story of human advancement is provided by these peoples whose architecture, arts graphic and plastic, laws and religions, prove them to have been the equals of most of the Asiatic nations of antiquity and the superiors of the primitive races of Europe. The aborigines of America had evolved for themselves an archi-

tectural science in some respects superior to any of which the Old World could boast. The result of centuries of isolation is evident in a profound contrast of atmosphere. It seems almost as if we stood for a space upon the dim shores of another planet, spectators of a race whose modes of thought and feeling we were entirely ignorant of! We catch the gleam and glitter of civilizations more remote and bizarre than those of the Orient, the ghosts of peoples and beliefs not the least splendid and solemn in the role of dead nations and vanished faiths." There is nothing with which to make comparisons.

It is now universally admitted that the cultures of the western world are unrelated to any found elsewhere. The respective cultures of America and Asia are wholly different; the former are distinctly and emphatically American and were evolved on this Continent.

The contention of this treatise is that their builders did likewise. Out of the unguessably-distant past they appeared, they rose, and they fell.

There has been an eternity of the past as well as an eternity still to come.

Donnelly says: "The inscriptions upon the monuments of Central America take us back to a civilization far anterior to the oldest known in Europe."

Dr. John Fiske in "Discovery of America," states: "It is becoming daily more evident that the old notion of influence from Asia has not a leg to stand on." At whatever point we touch upon the subject, we find scientific opinion tending more and more steadily toward the conclusion that its people and their culture *are indigenous*. Research has disclosed the fact that they have a lineage extending back for many, many centuries.

It may be good that there are fashions in dress and a hundred other peculiarities; but it is deeply to be regretted that there are schools of thought and "fashions" in science. Of all men the scientist should be free from bias and preconceived ideas.

For long it has been conventional to regard man as a newcomer to this continent; but the time has come for these outworn theories to be discarded.

Great minds are climbing out of the rut.

Men like Dr. Morley take a stand against the views of those who insist upon making immigrants of the only one-hundred-percent "Americans" who have ever dwelt on this Continent! Ever since the discovery of the New World, persistent and ingenious attempts have been made to derive our greatest native-American civilization, the Mayas, from some Old World origin. The truth, however, is that Mayan culture owes nothing to Old World inspiration, and its splendid achievements in art, architecture, sculpture, astronomy and chronology were essentially and exclusively the product of its own ingenuity. By their own sandals, as it were, the ancient Mayas lifted themselves from a state of savagery to the highest plane of intellectual development found upon this Continent before the coming of the white man." Their language, arithmetic and mode of time-reckoning bear no resemblance to any other system." Lewis Spence.

For centuries, however, we have persistently sought to rob them of the credit for their achievements, giving the glory to some mythical people from the Orient. Let us start to "give honor to whom honor is due"—the Red Man, who belongs to the ages as a distinct and separate race.

The leading archeologists of the world are agreed that the Mayas were an indigenously American race, and that their early leaders neither sailed to Yucatan from China, nor walked thither from Atlantis.

The Amerind was among the first of all the races of man who thought that he was not made to die and built up towards the skies, and from the skies drew such inspiration and beauty that Donnelly could write thus: "Mexico, under European rule, or under her own leaders, has never again risen to her former standard of refinement, wealth, prosperity or civilization."

In his generation the Amerind climbed high; and we greatly doubt if any other people similarly segregated could have risen any higher than he did.

This was no partially-cultivated nation. A lengthy series of ages must have elapsed before so segregated a people could rise to such heights. As one writer puts it: "They were masters in what we might call the social sciences; they had developed through religion, government and traditional folk-customs a racial stability and security for which we may well envy them today—a great and gifted people in the arts, in music, in sculpturing; workers in metal and masters of certain sciences including medicine and astronomy, the latter, of course, implying mathematical ability."

All this speaks of long periods of human life, of ages of growth and experience, the immense accumulation of consistent and uninterrupted progress lying behind the era which they represent.

Gregory Mason says: "There are archeological remains three thousand years old."

Ellsworth Huntingdon states: "There alone did men develop an architecture which not only in massiveness but in wealth of architectural adornment vies with that of early Egypt."

As Hyatt Verrill in his *Old Civilizations of the New World* says: "There is no doubt that these prehistoric Americans far excelled every other race of their time in many ways." That could only be accomplished with many centuries of gradual climbing behind them.

With all due respect to Dr. Breasted, Egyptian culture did *not* flourish when all the rest of the world was sunk in barbarism! Nay, as Maynard Shipley writes: "We shall have to face, from this time onward, the alternative of considering the western hemisphere as the seat of the earliest known civilized race."

When in that truly-remarkable book *The Outline of History*, Mr. H. G. Wells writes: "America was six thousand years behind the Old World," he is contrasting the

eastern cultures with the naked Islanders whom Columbus encountered — which is manifestly unfair and which he would no doubt rectify if the matter were brought to his attention. At that time there were people in the eastern hemisphere just as low as the Caribs—just as there were races in America quite as high as some of the Europeans.

The Temple of the Sun is 812 feet long by 470 ft. wide and 150 ft. high. The sacred fires of the shrine went out long centuries ago, and the worshippers have now vanished. However, the colossal structures erected by them at such cost and with such herculean labor testify mutely but eloquently to their greatness and venerable past.

As we gaze upon this marvellous structure, we are in imagination transported down the vast shadowy corridors of time, and we see ghostly men and women stretching back in an unbroken line, till they are lost in the far horizon of the dim beginnings of human endeavors.

The evolutionist will agree that it was a far cry from wandering, speechless primates, whose only tools were coliths, to the height and the glory of the Maya peoples!

Those imperishable monuments of Mayapan are mute witnesses of the existence of a great people in a bygone age.

As we look upon those patiently-carved stone faces of men on the Stelas, with eyes eternally gazing, with ears perpetually listening to the whispers of the present age, we can scarcely imagine the Mayas as having had six changes of government in one month! Even the graven stone faces seem to have a look of superiority and disdain! One writer states: "They seem incredibly and hideously wise, with an air of strange and secret sentience."

The question thus arises—has Central America advanced since the Mayas went back into the womb of time? Have there been centuries of retrogression? In *Mexico*, Stewart Chase says: "Between 1521 and 1950 lie over four centuries, and as I read the records, a slow and steady decline in civilization—a toboggan slide for four hundred years."

Is this all of human progress, all they get out of cen-

turies of human endeavor? A people born since the conquest, without any gods, without anything to believe in, and with such desperate need of faith.

There is every indication that the Mayan nation was very populous. Those sun-saturated lands of fertility could furnish nourishment for multitudes of people.

The numbers of ruined cities found buried in tropical vegetation and covered with the debris of centuries attest the fact as Professor Carstens says, that "This must have been one of the most thickly-populated regions on the face of the globe. Not only are there many cities, but numbers of them spread over very large areas. What interested us most was the fact that even the oldest of the cities through which we traveled had perfect systems of drainage, were laid out in regular form, with wide streets, and stone bridges over ravines and rivers. Judging from the extent of the well-paved roads which traverse the regions, there must have been very extensive commerce there in long past ages. As we passed through city after city, we found evidence of the fact that the origin of civilization in America must be sought for in ages more remote than it has been the custom heretofore to look for it."

The ruins of Palenque and Mitla, as likewise the remains of Chitchan-Itza and other cities, have no points of similarity to Asian structures but lean rather to the European.

"The Palenque ruins are 24 miles long one way. The palace is 228 feet long and 180 feet wide. It has 14 doorways on each side, and 11 at the ends. It was built entirely of hewn stone, laid with admirable precision in mortar which seems to have been of the best quality. The architectural work is richly decorated." Thus writes Captain Del Rio.

Says Baldwin: "If we suppose Palenque to have been deserted some six hundred years previous to the Spanish Conquest, this date will carry us back only to the last days of its history as an inhabited city. Beyond it, in the distant past, is a vast period in which the civilization represented

by Palenque was developed, made capable of building such cities, and then carried on through the many ages during which cities became numerous, flourished, grew old, and gave place to others, until the long history of Palenque itself began."

Ancient American architecture has a character of originality peculiar to itself. The buildings are purely native art.

There have been those who have insisted on dragging the Mayas from Egypt; but the buildings have no Egyptian hieroglyphics on them. The sculptures on the Palenque buildings are in relief, while all Egyptian are in intaglio. No offshoot from eastern lands is this.

To quote Baldwin once more: "The ruins of Egypt and those in America have nothing in common; the ruined monuments show that the original Americans were profoundly different from the ancient Egyptians."

How did this vast population live? When the people of Europe were nomads, living by the fruits of the chase, the Amerind had developed wild grasses and evolved food plants.

The corn of today is purely American and was unknown to the rest of mankind until the discovery of America.

"In one of the ancient cities," continues Professor Carstens, "where some slight excavations were made, the expedition found bins of corn placed there untold centuries before. Evidently a local fire reduced that corn to carbon and thus preserved it throughout the following centuries."

We may never know what caused the dense population of Central America to dwindle away and those many silver cities to be deserted. If we knew or could discover why they fell, we might then know how to save ourselves when our time comes.

Perhaps "politics" and "corruption" became interchangeable terms in those early American days the same as they are in these later times!

The secret of the birth and death of this ancient Empire is in all probability forever lost.

In some manner they failed in their lengthy upward groping. Why? How? These remain questions unanswered.

With all his faults, the white man cannot be blamed for it. Copan was old before the birth of Christ. These were dead and buried cities before the Caucasian got the idea that he had been commissioned to "take up the white man's burden" (and, incidentally, exploit the weak!).

Of the palace at Mitla, Violett-le-Duc writes: "The monuments of Greece and Rome in their best time can alone compare with the splendor of this great edifice."

Thomas Gann says: "In many ways theirs was the highest culture the world has ever known."

Some have held that the Mayas were Malasians who had roved across the Pacific. However, Baldwin refutes that dream also by saying "There is nothing Malayan in either the antiquities or the ancient speech of these countries."

Many have claimed for the American Indian a Japanese or Chinese origin. We give still another quotation from Baldwin: "There is no trace of Japan or China in the old ruins." The *Encyclopedia Britannica* states: "The cultures of the two hemispheres are strikingly different." In the Amerind there is a strangeness which is impenetrable.

A favorite argument for the Asian origin of the Indian has been the fact that base reliefs of the heads of elephants were found, with trunks well defined. Immediately the thoughtless jump to the conclusion that Oriental settlers had brought them knowledge of those animals—even Mr. Wells himself alludes to that old "evidence." It would, in our opinion, be wiser to question whether such animals ever did live in America. Numerous bones of the Columbian elephant found in Florida, with teeth 12 inches in length, attest the fact that those creatures *did* live here; and who shall say that they disappeared from these shores before the early inhabitants saw them? An old Castilian explorer upon seeing so many of them being unearthed at

a certain spot remarked: "This part must at one time have been overrun with elephants." Also the *American Journal of Science* informs us that artifacts associated with the elephant have been found in Florida and various other States. Even the conservative Dr. Hrdlicka points out that "now extinct animals may have lived up to a few thousands of years ago and have been contemporary of the earlier American man. Thus elephants may conceivably, even probably, have been known to these early builders."

Naturalists have always supposed that the American mastodon had been extinct for at least 50,000 years; but Dr. W. B. Scott, Professor of Geology at Princeton University, told the National Academy of Sciences at Washington that the elephant-like animal just mentioned may have lived in the State of New York only a few hundred years before the time of Columbus. He reaches this conclusion from fossils found in northeastern North America and also from the fact that a complete skeleton of a mastodon found near Quito, Ecuador, furnished convincing evidence that the animal had been slain by Indians not later than the 4th Century A.D.

There are also carved heads of Africans with noses, thick lips and curly hair. This author has seen them. Is it not more than likely that Negro castaways may have been washed up on the shores of such a maritime nation?

The Phoenicians are credited with the invention of writing in the Old World—but the aboriginal Amerind had invented a system of written communication peculiarly his own.

The Mayans evolved the miracle of writing in America. Many of their strange hieroglyphics relate exclusively to astronomy—this at a time when few people on earth could read or write!

"So far as now understood there is no relationship between any kind of Amerindian writing and that of any other race. Like everything else pertaining to the Amerind people, the development appears to have been purely

indigenous." *North Americans of Yesterday*. Dellenbaugh.

"The American hieroglyphics contain no element to prove their foreign origin, and there is no reason to look upon them as other than the result of original native development." Bancroft.

On a stela at Tikal in Guatemala there is a date which goes back 1,841,639,800 days (5 million years)! The stela itself bears a date corresponding to our A.D. 267. What by comparison are the few minutes and hours ticked off by the little time-recording machine that the usurper carries in his pocket!

What the records of this vast period of time are intended to indicate, it is impossible for us to say. Do they refer to the creation of the world? Do they indicate the first appearance of the Mayas in Guatemala? How ancient the building is, we have no means of knowing. It was a pile of almost buried and forgotten ruins ages ago.

Professor Morley has solved the number-system of the Mayas, but thus far the glyphs commemorating important events have proved undecipherable. Another deciphered is August 6, 1613 B.C.; but in the dim womb of time our foster ancestors lived in caves, built houses of tree branches, and erected towns of wood before they began to carve in stone.

In *Rediscovering America* Gregory Mason writes: "It may be said that the early American astronomers were more civilized than the rough European men at arms who conquered them. They created a painting, a sculpture, a mathematics and an astronomy worthy of the best art and science of Europe."

Maya chiography was not elaborated by a semi-civilized race, but by men with highly-trained minds. We can read the "picture-writing" of the Old World cultures, but the key to the writing of the Mayas is lacking. All the legacy which the Mayans of today have is the names of old sages, like something shining far off in the centuries, and the things that they did are all dim and shadowy now.

To quote Morgan in the *National Geographic Magazine*, "When it comes to a knowledge of the abstract sciences, such as arithmetic, chronology and astronomy, they had few peers even in the Old World."

The Mayas had invented a calendar more accurate than the Julian Calendar used by Europe at that time! In his *Conquest of Mexico*, Prescott points out that "The Julian Calendar which the Spaniard used was, according to the more perfect calendar of the Mayas, eleven days in advance of the correct time—a remarkable fact." This was their high-water mark, the cumulative knowledge of many centuries.

It was not until 1582 that the Gregorian day-count was perfected—which more nearly corresponds to the Maya day-count.

Think of the despised Amerind working out an almanac 1500 years ahead of Europe! Nay, in the volume just referred to Mr. Prescott further observes: "It is an open question whether Mayan chronology in the field of lapsed time is not more accurate even than our Gregorian calendar of today."

The almanac used by the Mayas, before they knew that white men existed, is said by experts to be so intricate and so accurate that it can identify any day within a range of a quarter of a million years!

Back in the years when Tacitus A.D. 80 and Jerome A.D. 300 could write of Britons eating one another, the Mayas had been intelligent astronomers for centuries!

Dr. Spinden tells us that "highly accurate predictions of eclipses of the sun and the moon were made by the Mayan Indians eight centuries before Christ."

The Mayan Calendar ran without the loss of a day for 2,148 years and controlled the civil and religious life of several nations.

Many long, long centuries must have elapsed since the Red Man first began to think before he could rise to such Einstein-like modes of reckoning! He must have spent

long ages in dreams and desires before the achievement of such accomplishments.

Dr. Spinden has recently uncovered a circular Observatory in Mayapan, and that same eminent authority has shown that the Calendar of the Mayas took its beginnings from certain events celestial in the 7th century B.C. although there is evidence that its makers must have had a fairly high civilization for some two or three thousand years before that time. "Starting with observations of the heavens, some four thousand years ago, the Maya Calendar was developed to a point where it was possible to distinguish without duplication any given day in 370,000 years! This was far in advance of European astronomy." Lewis Spence in *Mexico*.

While the art and architecture of those ancient people of the mist is so radically different from that of the Old World that there is no faint resemblance thereto, it is significant to note that the astronomical calculations are similar. Both alike had the same great celestial "picture-book" to read, and the Mayan astronomers calculated the Calendar of the sun and moon with greater accuracy than did the Romans.

It took many generations to breed a race of men who could thus accurately read the book of the heavens and so perfectly understand its print.

Says Dr. Spinden: "The writing out of the Mayan Calendar involved place-value one thousand years before it was known anywhere in the Old World. Mayan mathematics invented zero several centuries before its separate invention by Arabs."

There have been those who sought to belittle the civilization of the Amerind. They have reduced Tenochtitlan to just a town of mud buildings like what we have today in Taos, New Mexico. They have ridiculed the expression "The Empire of the Incas," but it is a noteworthy fact (which can readily be verified by any reader who takes the trouble to do so) that none of those slighting writers ever

beheld the stately Temples which are still standing. To *see* is to *believe*!

In his boyhood the writer recalls reading books wherein the authors doubted the existence of the "Great Wall of China," and questioned the veracity of those who professed to have seen it!

No further proof is required of the great antiquity of these people than the Calendar referred to in this chapter. Therefrom we can discern many centuries of upward climbing, all unaided, with every step forged out by themselves.

As a dominant people they have disappeared into the mists whence they came. They "had their day and ceased to be."

The solid gold coffins found buried there, under the debris of centuries, hold only a little dust. The clay is transfigured into flowers. The spirit has departed. Yet in many quarters it is customary to speak of America as a Continent without a history! Nations rise and fall. The Amerind had his day. Now the white man wears the halo around his shoulders!

Dr. Breasted of the Chicago University declares that "There have been 500,000 years of human endeavor." In such a lapse of time, the white man arose as it were but yesterday. Aristotle wrote: "The inhabitants of Northern climes, though endowed with plenty of spirit, are wanting in intelligence and skill, while the reverse is true of the Asiatics."

Nordic theorizers should take a glance backward. The Nordics were the last to emerge from savagery.

What race may rule the earth centuries hence is only in the mind of the Eternal. To each nation and race its measure.

As has been elsewhere stated, history knows of no nation that has ever had a second attainment to heights of glory. The Creator is impartial. Truly nations do *rise* and *fall*! Thus far, at least, human history has been cycli-

cal, races having always returned to their point of beginning.

The primeval native of these lands lived far from what we might describe as the historical zone. The center of the world and the flux of human races was around the Mediterranean Sea.

The two greatest oceans of the world, one upon either side of him, shut the Amerind in. It was only natural that he should have regarded himself as being the only man created by Itza-ama.

Now, even Itza-ama, Father of gods and men, sits mute, pathetic, helpless and forgotten for these many centuries. Itza-ama, Who gave them life, has gathered most of His worshippers to Himself again. The few survivors that are left look and act like prehistoric creatures. They can hardly be said to be living. They are a people of the past, and the most that can be said is that they still survive, amid ruins, and unfathomable thoughts. In a sense they are dead while they yet live in despairing stoicism. Their minds have quit. Their eyes have only dreams in them.

History is replete with other instances proving that when their gods die the people give up hope.

Records indicate that the last thing which a race forgets is the name of their god; but the blackening shadows are stealing over Itza-ama's memory. Whereas millions once bowed the knee to him, now all the adoration that he receives from the Indian is a furtive prostration and a mumbled phrase or two which have lost all meaning—and that only when the white man's back is turned.

To discover them prostrating themselves before the crumbling temples of a faith, whose meaning they no longer know, and stealthily burning incense, is poignantly pathetic. The idea of incensing the gods is as old as time.

The days of the Amerind are over. The fires of his youth are extinguished. The divine light has gone out, and it is dark. The glory of long centuries is past. When Columbus landed upon their soil, the doom of the Red

race was sealed. Now "the lion and the lizard keep the court where Jamshyd gloried and drank deep."

The decadent aborigines of today, unaware of their lengthy and glorious past, have gone far upon the path of retrogression.

The need to count time stopped when the white man found them.

What an anomaly it is to think of 20th century Mayas living in hovels with wattled walls held up by twisted posts, squatting on dirt floors, unwashed, illiterate, eating from gourd dishes, worshipping mud gods, when in the earth underneath their feet are the relics of palaces of art, with walls of cut stone, sublimely-dignified columns and tessellated pavements, beautiful baths, pottery of wonderful beauty, and gods of carved stone—all the work of their forefathers who could read and write!

"Sic transit gloria mundi!" The genesis of those supermen who rose out of the womb of time to such culture is, unfortunately, forever lost. Sombre shadows cover them. They and time were children together!

In his *Current History*, Edgar Lloyd Hampton writes as follows: "Thousands of years must have been required to evolve from a state of savagery to so high a degree of civilization, while the evidence of its slow development would have filled all the intervening centuries. Thus it is possible that the structures in the more ancient ruins on this continent were reared to the sky before the days of Babylon or before Ulysses was born. Yet these events only mark the steps in their evolution. The climax of this culture of the Mayas, according to our scientists, attained its highest point some time near the beginning of the Christian era."

Men who were on intimate terms with infinity have been so repressed by the impact of what we call "civilization" that today they can count only up to "my two hands and my two feet"—as the author has personally found to be a fact in the case of the survivors. "Some of him lived but the most of him died."

Pieces of the past and ruins of what has been may go on existing after all hope is dead. Today the Mayas are the last degraded remnants of a fallen and dying race, mute and helpless.

That calendar of the unknown ages which began 841,-639,800 days ago has ended with Night! "Time" for the Mayas has ceased. They had much of it.

But little of the writings left by them can be deciphered, The strange glyphs are incomprehensible to us, except for a word or two here and there.

That peculiar glyph translatable "*Akbal—Night—The Beginning*," stands out.

Then came "the Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world," with succeeding centuries of the glorious brightness of a golden age under *Hunab-Ku*, the One Supreme, Almighty and Invisible Deity, when men rose out of themselves and reached out into infinity.

Then a period of primeval twilight—"sunset and evening-star." And again *Akbal-Night*. The final ending! The common fate of all mankind!

How strangely like the Genesis of the Hebrews—"In the beginning—darkness—God created etc." Then all the years since creation.

However, while the Christian religion begins with "night" it ends with "morning."

Maya history closes with *Akbal-Night*. Back into the darkness again.

And the pitiful words, written since the advent of the White Man—"It ended with those called Maya."

"God placed us here, and then forsook and forgot us." Still the shadows lengthen.

Though the regnant sovereignty of that Spain which reached across the sea to enslave them is now forever shorn of might, a few of the Mayas are left to note their fall.

For victor and vanquished alike—oblivion!

THE DISCOVERY OF PERU

“Ye cliffs of masonry—enormous piles,
Which no rude censure of familiar time
Nor record of our puny race defiles,
In dateless mystery ye stand sublime;
Memorials of an age of which we see
Only types in things that once were ye.”

CHAPTER XVI

THE DISCOVERY OF PERU

"The supreme hours unnoted come; unfelt, the turning tides of doom."

Whittier.

And now the curtain rises on Old Peru.

Below the equator, the Spaniards discovered a higher type of American than the Aztecs. Pizarro and his adventurers entered the Empire of the Incas in 1519. Yea, verily EMPIRE because the Kingdom was a fifty-days' journey from north to south—a much larger realm than Spain! At that time England had no "empire" and only about four million people spoke English.

A monarchy with so great an area and population had no amateur government. Historians testify that it was better than any which Europe or Asia or Africa could boast at that time.

Perched 10,000 ft. up in the Eternal Hills, in a deep gorge of the Andes, lay the capital of this Indian kingdom—"Cuzco," the Golden Navel. There God-descended Peruvian royalty had founded a microcosm of their own. Cuzco was the "Jerusalem," the "Mecca"—the abode of their gods.

"In the days of Inca's glory, Cuzco could vie in sanctity, grandeur, power and even wealth with the great cities of the ancient world."—*Showalter.*

The holy city of Cuzco was a worthy capital. It is impossible at this date to determine what population the city had. However, the lowest estimate we have found gives the number as 50,000 and the highest as 200,000. Today the population is 30,000.

Due to their illiteracy, the Conquistadores' records are not at all dependable. Even Pizarro, the leader of them, could neither read nor write. Someone has said "Cuzco was not founded—it was found, and has never been returned!" There are evidences that its best days were over before Europeans landed, but it was still a rich and flourishing city. The Spaniards found ten planks of pure silver, each piece 20 ft. long, 1 ft. wide and $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches thick, being built into a new palace in the course of construction for one of the nobles. Gold and precious stones were there in abundance.

Sarmiento, the Spanish historian, whose words are here translated, writes regarding a Feast of the Dead which the early Spaniards witnessed in Cuzco, "Neither in Jerusalem, Rome or Persia, nor in any other part of the world, was there ever so much gold and silver and precious stones displayed." Naturally all of this treasure eventually found its way into the coffers of the conquerors, for its Nemesis was now overtaking the city.

In to this empire of splendor and religion rode the mailed Spaniards on their silver-shod horses. It was like a bolt from the blue. Like the Egyptians, the "Children of the Sun" were unacquainted with iron; but the men of Castile had long previously discovered that silver and gold were plentiful, while iron was unknown.

Atahualpa, the king of the "Children of the Sun," reigned over his twenty or thirty million of subjects in regal splendor.

From all accounts, he must have been the richest monarch the world has ever known.

The "borla" upon his brow was adorned with the largest emerald ever known! Also some of the finest emeralds they had discovered were embodied in a necklace which the King wore. One hundred pounds weight of gold was later collected by the Spaniards and these emeralds were embodied in a magnificent crown made for the "Queen of Heaven" in a town called Popoyan. When the crown was completed,

the filigree-work had reduced the weight of the gold to 25 lbs. and the crown was valued at seven and a half million dollars! That crown (which the writer happens to have seen just recently) is now in the United States. It is being offered for sale for four and a half million dollars, so if you are in the market for a coronal adornment, reader, at a reasonable price, here is your chance! Thus the cycle goes on.

The Conquerors were greatly impressed by the elaborate ceremonies of the King's Court. The matter of "precedence" was quite a serious one, and the rank of the Nobles had to be most carefully defined. It is of interest to note here, that with all our vaunted professions of "democracy," we haven't travelled so very far from the now archaic Court of Atahualpa, for a *golden* key can open almost any door here!

The Inca king was captured and imprisoned in one of the apartments of his palace which the Conquerors tell us had 500 rooms! He offered and paid to the Spaniards a ransom of \$16,800,000 (15 tons of gold) for his release! After paying the ransom (the largest in recorded history, we believe) Aatahualpa was strangled! Thus perished the king who had proudly boasted "I am the greatest prince upon the earth." Never since time began was there a more disgraceful and perfidious breach of faith. The drama went on. Both its glory and its shame will be spoken of with bated breath so long as the world endures. When "the tumult and the shouting died," and with the semi-divine monarch dead and the hated strangers plundering and destroying on every hand, the empire fell to pieces.

Prescott writes that "The Temple of the Sun was the most magnificent structure in the New World, and was surpassed, probably, in the costliness of its decoration, by no buildings in the old." This beautiful edifice was the first to be despoiled and destroyed. The sacred flame in its golden casket was forever extinguished. The figure of the sun was so large that it occupied an entire end of the temple,

from one wall to the other. This great golden "Sun" and the silver "Moon" were the chief objects of their devotion. The Inca Indians were planet-worshippers.

It may be argued by some that in this fact they show at least a trace of Oriental origin; but if a man's urge is to worship something physical, what more impressive and awe-inspiring object of adoration is there than the sun? Surely man does not need to be taught that the sun is the great giver of light and heat, and the Bible tells us that "the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament sheweth His handiwork." The Spaniards drew lots for the golden sun just referred to, which they tell us weighed one hundred pounds. The golden furniture and the holy vessels were melted and molded into bars.

"Coriancha" (as it was termed) was literally a *mine* of gold. All the furniture and utensils were of precious metal. The four walls of the temple, Garcilaso tells us, were covered with plates and slabs of gold.

No other religious edifice of all time is reputed to have been as rich in gold and precious stones as was this temple "Coriancha." "The value of the jewels that adorned the chief temple of Cuzco was equal to one hundred and eighty millions of dollars." *The New American Encyclopedia*.

The Inca Empire has furnished the world with \$2,500,000,000 worth of silver since its discovery! This amount in bullion would make twenty-five (American) billions of silver dollars!

It has been thought by some writers that the Royal Inca family of rulers were not of the same race as the people that they governed—that perhaps they were superior strangers from some eastern land, who had landed on the shores of Ecuador or Peru and usurped such authority. However, there is no hint of this to be found in the ancient chronicles of the Conquistadores. Atahualpa and his family were accepted by the Iberians as being Indians, and no difference of race is mentioned as either actual or suspected.

The great High Priest of this temple was second only

to the King himself in dignity, and 400 lesser Priests officiated at its solemn services.

Their monks and nuns throughout the kingdom were numbered by the tens of thousands.

The "Virgins of the Sun" were violated; and their building all complete and furnished was later turned into the Nunnery of Santa Catalina. Upon a recent visit to Cuzco, the author found that Catholic Nuns were now occupying the identical cells which the Virgins of the Sun had tenanted.

Thus Atahuallpa's kingdom passed into the hands of Spain. The old age ended and a new age began. The new history was written in blood—every page deeply encarnadined. The 16th century was the "cross-roads" of the ages.

Inca gold and Inca glory are but a far-off legend now.

For uncounted years time had flowed on in the Land of the Setting Sun undisturbed by foreign alarms; but in the hectic days of the Spanish conquest, time impetuously rushed forward like a whirlwind. The thunderous volume of foreigners flowed over the poor Indian in torrents as if over the brink of an abyss. Some were stranded upon the shores, left in the backwash and eddies. These survivors were dazed and broken and out of their element. The cycle of the Incas was ended.

In the fury of the conquest there was destroyed that which the vandal hands could not build up again. In the search for hidden treasure, palaces and temples were torn down stone by stone. Ruins are now all that remains to tell the story of the grandeur that had been there.

When Inti, the Inca Sun-god, was torn down, the glory departed from the Incas; and when the Temple was desolated, the sun set upon Cuzco.

Some years later the Inca sun showed a few sickly gleams when a remote scion of the royal house named Tupac Amaru incited the people to rebellion. However, that faint afterglow quickly faded out when the uncle, the son-in-law and the wife of the patriot had their tongues cut out by the Spanish invaders. They were then executed before

the eyes of Tupac Amaru in order that death might be made more horrible to him by the sight of their agonies. Then, after his own tongue had been removed, he was torn to pieces by four horses attached to his four limbs—"man's inhumanity to man, makes countless thousands mourn."

X X X X X

Those five crosses are intended to represent quite unprintable horrors that were perpetuated at that time, for, as one historian records: "The discovery of America was the occasion of the greatest outburst of reckless cruelty and greed known to history."

Such, we have regretfully to state, were Spain's beginnings in America.

Another historian writes that "Spain has the unenviable credit of having destroyed two great civilizations."

Pizarro's embalmed body (in a glass case) can now be viewed by the curious in a dark corner in the Cathedral at Lima. The sight gives one a strange feeling and recalls most vividly the scenes witnessed in this region.

The story of the subjugation of the Incas is a lengthy one. For more than six months Cuzco was besieged, and in the convulsions of a dying civilization tens of thousands were killed; but the rainbow-hued banners, passed from hand to hand, were gory with human blood ere they were trampled into the dust by the Spanish horses.

Men with copper spears and stone slings, however brave they may be, are no match for men with fire-arms and horses. The attack was unexpected by (as well as by methods unknown too) those attacked.

The conquest was perhaps the most inglorious in all history. It was a flood which drowned and destroyed all the past. As Swinburne says, "The Spaniards made accursed the name of man and thrice-accursed the name of God." All believed that if only a hand were crippled in the "glorious" strife, that would be sufficient to gain for its possessor

eternal life! Stone-slings (as Goliath found out to his sorrow) can kill as well as wound.

Thus did a handful of brave (if ruthless) adventurers gain a kingdom as large as their own Spain—with Portugal, Austria, Hungary, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Switzerland and France as well!

What else is there in all the legends of romance or chivalry that surpasses this? Do you desire a "human interest" story? Then read how the world's most ancient race rose by slow and painful gropings, extending through many millenniums of time till they reached a considerable height, in an unknown and inaccessible portion of the earth—only to be discovered and then exterminated by a newer and upstart race arrogating to themselves the right so to do!

We mourn the fact that certain animals and birds are becoming extinct, but what of human civilizations?

The final transfer of governments was not accomplished without lengthy and terrific struggles and many barbarities. Men, women and children by the hundreds were trampled to death by the Spanish horses shod with Inca silver!

Many a Spanish "soldier of fortune" when captured received all the gold he craved—but not in the manner he had hoped for! Bars of the precious metal were melted by the Indians, and with the words "Eat, Christian, eat!" the molten mass was poured down his throat!

Famine—which was so common in Europe and in Asia—had been unknown in Old Peru; but now even that was added to their other horrors, and thousands were starved to death.

Royalty and nobles were reduced to beggary and Spanish dirt. This the aftermath.

Atahualpa had bathed himself daily in a bath-tub of beaten gold; and it is a matter of history that the next bathtub of any sort that America saw was in 1820—three hundred years after Atahualpa's gorgeous tub had been melted down and moulded into bars!

Irving Berdine Richman has culled from some old chron-

icles information as to the sum which each soldier-of-fortune received, and writes as follows: "To Pizarro himself nearly \$700,000 and 2300 marks of silver; to Hernando Pizarro nearly \$365,000 not counting silver; to De Soto \$270,000, without counting silver; to each horseman \$103,000; and to the foot-soldiers nearly \$52,000 each."

When we read in Dr. Lord's *History* that a laborer could purchase more for five cents 300 years ago than he can do for a dollar today, they were indeed "soldiers-of-fortune!"

Thenceforth, the all-conquering white man was to rule. The Indian's "*future*" was *behind him!* The Amerind's isolation of so many ages' duration was over, and the hands of the clock of time can never be turned back.

"The moving finger writes; and, having writ
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

—Omar Khayyam.

That part, at least, of the Rubaiyat is true!

The man in "the land where the sun sleeps" was now the vassal of Spain, commencing the Trail of Tears.

No such conquest can ever be made again; just as there are no more "Manhattan Islands" in the market for \$24.00!

No such utter destruction of a race is today conceivable—unless in some future age the "Martians" swoop down upon our then effete civilization and wipe it out!

Some of the immediate relatives of the King were able to escape from the conquering Spaniards, but they were pursued and captured.

When travelling in Spain, the author learned that some of the eye-witnesses of these early stirring scenes were able to make pretty good drawings of the same. There are pictures which indicate how those unfortunate individuals

were captured and burnt to death. Others, however, managed to reach the jungles and were thus lost sight of.

Baron Humboldt, writing in the 18th century, penned the following words: "It is interesting to enquire whether any other princes of the family of Manco Capac have remained in the forests; and if there still exist any of the Incas of Peru in other places." The author believes that to him belongs the credit of discovering in a more southerly forest a remnant of those people, still carrying on their sun and moon worship.

It is natural to suppose that the Indians buried a large part of their treasure in deep wells and fissures in the rocks, but how much, will never be known.

In the tombs of the nobles great quantities of gold were found. Humboldt tells of visiting the sepulchre of one of these princes "where a Spaniard drew forth a mass of gold worth a million dollars!"

Ponce de Leon failed to find the "Fountain of Youth" so eagerly sought for by many; but his fellow-countrymen tapped veritable "fountains of *gold*"—which went to make Europe strong for the ensuing four centuries!

An old English sailor said, in the spirit of the time, "Why man, all their dripping-pans are pure gold; the prisoners they take are fettered in gold; and as for rubies and diamonds, they goe forth on holidayes and gather them by the seashore to hang on their children's coates!"

In the period of the first twenty-five years after the conquest, the Castilians sent to Spain more than two (American) billions of dollars of gold! The Custom House at Seville overflowed with ingots of solid gold!

Little did Atahuallpa dream that his gold would be transported in strange galleons across uncharted seas for the enrichment of a nation he did not even know existed, or that his colossal wealth would enrich another whole continent called "Europe" for four hundred years!

Truly, Columbus changed world-affairs, and made many

hearts beat faster; but it spelled inevitable doom to the old races he discovered.

From the ashes of American civilization there arose a wealthy Europe, which led the world to heights undreamed of before.

The gold of the Indies replenished the coffers of Spain after its ten years of War driving out the Moors, and it filled with envy every European Court.

Scores of these treasure-ships sailing across to Spain were a temptation; and British ships and French ships in envious warfare plundered many a Spanish galleon of its ingots. On one occasion Drake looted a million pounds Sterling in gold! On another occasion he secured twenty-six tons of pure silver, eighty tons of gold, and emeralds to the value of \$750,000!

The sister country of Portugal appealed to Pope Alexander for a share—so he drew a line down the map of South America, which “establishes to all eternity the line of demarcation between Spanish and Portuguese possessions.” Portugal thus secured the land of the Holy Cross now called “Brazil,” but which on the then Pope’s map was designated “Labrador.”

The Spanish Flag has been said to represent a river of gold between two rivers of blood. It took rivers of blood to get the gold—and many more of such rivers to turn the gold westward again.

In a very real sense Europe experienced a “new birth” through the discovery of America. At all events, “its youth was renewed like the eagle’s.”

America’s gold, as it became scattered, contributed largely to the form of metallic currency with which Europe has carried on her commerce ever since.

Europe’s face was, so to speak, turned from east to west, and has so continued from then on.

In the hey-day of her might, Spain ruled three-fourths of the earth; but became bloated with her ill-gotten gains and commenced to decline. Whenever a nation’s flag is arro-

gantly unfurled on a "Tower of Babel," deterioration and decay set in. As the Bible says: "He that getteth riches, and not by right, shall leave them in the midst of his day, and at his end shall be a fool." Long ago Spain lost all she had gained, and now is poor indeed.

Due to the Inquisition, Iberia was 200 years behind the rest of Europe, and has so remained.

The Spaniard does not progress. The author knows him in his own land as also in all his erstwhile Colonies. He is a likeable sort of fellow and we love his soft, mellifluous language. Spain—the oldest of the European nations—still lingers on, but she is surely following in the wake of the once-mighty Egyptians, Greeks and Romans.

The tragedy of the Spanish conquest is that while the Dons were brave and efficient to a remarkable degree, the age in which they lived was a cruel and ignorant one.

It is doubtful if the Peru, Bolivia and Ecuador of today—which constituted the Inca Kingdom—is as truly civilized, law-abiding, and worthy of "a place in the sun" as was the old monarchy with all of its prehistoric backwardness. This statement is not made without extensive study of the history of these lands and without intimate knowledge of the conditions there today.

Did Cuzco deserve destruction in order that there might be erected on its ruins what the Conquerors brought to Peru? Squier states that "Under the Incas there was a better government, better protection of life, and better facilities for the pursuit of happiness, less pauperism and vice, than have existed since the Spanish conquest or do exist today."

Baldwin speaks the truth when he notes "At no time since the conquest has the country been as orderly, as prosperous, or as populous as they found it. It has fallen to a much lower condition." It is not surprising that the Peru of today, born of such a sanguinary marriage, should recently have had four Presidents in eight days!

Today we see flimsy superstructures surmounting foundations of perfectly-cut stones, some of them 20 and 30

feet long. With regard to these, Professor Ross writes: "No doubt this is the finest mason's work in the world." It is beyond the skill of modern workmen to restore it.

Squier is correct when he declares that "The world has nothing to show in the way of stone-cutting to surpass the skill and accuracy displayed in the Inca structures of Cuzco; all modern work of the kind looks crude and barbarous in comparison."

On and out of the ruins of the Temple in Cuzco was built the Church of La Merced and a Monastery. After seeing the matchless lower walls of this edifice—now crowned with a poor, trashy cane-mud-and-whitewash balcony—the writer can find no better language to describe it than Bryce's—"A more exquisitely finished piece of work cannot be imagined!" It stands before a nation's sight like a gravestone over buried rights.

The old Inca ethics must have been high. On of their ancient laws reads: "Judges who receive bribes from their clients are to be considered as thieves meriting death." Back there in the depths of time, they decreed that lying and stealing were treasonable; but the three commandments taught to every Inca child are not now thought necessary for our admonition! They were:

Ama sua (Be not a thief)

Ama llula (Be not a liar)

Ama Quilla (Be not indolent)

The marriage rite was solemnized with as much formality as in a Christian country; but since Spanish occupation, the U. S. Commissioner to South America (William E. Curtis) has stated that "Seventy percent of the children born are illegitimate." Peru has indeed retrograded. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon emigrants of the north who took their wives with them, the Spaniards married? the daughters of the country. In his book Dr. Draper says: "Peru was morally and intellectually superior to the Europe of the 16th century. There never was such a state of moral degrada-

tion in any Christian country as in South America." If the author of *Beacon Lights of History*, who penned the above statement, had visited any Spanish-speaking Republic, he would have omitted the word "Christian." This will, we know, meet with indignant denials in some quarters. Live there and see! How many, many children have we met there who did not know who their father was; and (softly) neither did their mother!

The Spanish sense of values did not see that the introduction of the lowly Peruvian potato and corn to the rest of mankind would do the world more real good than all the bullion.

The value of a single crop of potatoes in the world today probably greatly exceeds that of all the gold which the Conquerors took from the Incas—even though the latter were so vast as to be almost fabulous.

Strange that so few gave thought *then*—and still stranger that so few give thought *now*—to the enormous debt we owe to the Amerind!

The gold and silver above referred to were the least of all the Amerind's gifts to posterity. Let us mention some of these—corn, peppers, henequen, common and sweet potatoes, tomatoes, cocoa, peanuts, tobacco, rubber, ipecacuanha, cocaine, quinine, cascara, pumpkins, vanilla, chicle, squashes, sarsaparilla, beans, cotton, cassava, indigo, copal, cochineal, strawberries, persimmons, pawpaws and pine-apples; guinea pigs and turkeys! Truly a gigantic legacy! None of these things, at that time, grew in any other zone of the world.

The old Indian "Burbank" (not the Wizard of California!) who turned wild grasses into corn, and some unknown root into potatoes, blessed mankind thereby. By his ingenious discoveries and experiments he saved millions from death. Pity that his name should be lost and that the succulent vegetable should now be known to many as the "Irish" potato! So it is to some old and forgotten Amerind that we have to give the thanks for our potatoes

—which were unknown to the other world, and we may wish for him a place in the lap of Inti, his Creator, in the "Palace of the Sun"—that "Elysium" to which all good Peruvians were supposed to go!

And what shall we say of tobacco—another purely American product? Perhaps the late Rudyard Kipling might be paged to reply facetiously: "A woman is only a woman; but a good cigar's a smoke!"

In *Native Races*, Bancroft observes: "Left alone they might have unfolded into as bright a civilization as that of Europe."

"In the wealth of our inheritance, let us pause a while to contemplate the fate of Old Peru, where a great civilization died intestate. If perfection in textile art were the measure of a people's culture, ancient Peru would rank with the great civilizations of antiquity. They carried spinning to the highest perfection the world has ever seen. A garment of old gold, black, white and red, which we found, might have been the costume of an Olympian god. Salome danced before Herod in no more lovely draperies." And—"as ancient as anything we find in Asia or Egypt." M. D. Crawford of the American Museum of Natural History.

Gregory Mason states that: "For arrangement of color and design, and for spinning and weaving, the tapestries of Peru surpass any in the world, even including the famous Gobelin tapestries of Europe." King Phillip the second of Spain did not scorn to use the dead Incas' hand-me-downs.

The Peruvians wove linen which it is admitted surpasses any woven in Ireland today!

They invented gold teeth at least one thousand years before American dentists did so! The author has seen a mummy with both an upper and a lower set of gold teeth! At a Dental Conference recently, Dr. Bernhard Weinberger, a New York surgeon, spoke of "inlays of gold made successfully by the Indians as early as 600 A.D.

Not only did the pre-Columbian Indians in South America understand the technique of the inlay—they alone among

ancients," said Dr. Weinberger, "knew how to preserve teeth, and they were able to transplant and implant teeth." See prominent notices of that art being discovered in 1939.

How many of our modern surgeons realize that in the Middle Ages no doctors in the world could compare for skill with the surgeons of the Inca Empire?

How many are aware of the fact that these ancient Peruvians knew how to trepan an injured skull: and that they were probably the first medical men in the world to use anaesthetics when performing operations?

Their brain-surgery was not the work of novices, for we see plainly from a number of skulls examined that the patients had survived the operation.

Furthermore, this western world made many contributions to archeology which are well worth studying. Professor Cook of Yale points out that "The Peruvians built aqueducts and reclamation projects that are unequalled elsewhere. The work is beyond our comprehension. Compared to the Hanging Gardens of Peru, those of Babylon sink into insignificance. They accomplished the seemingly impossible! Our undertakings are poor indeed in the face of what this vanished race accomplished, and this when savage Europe lived in caves!"

When the conquering Romans were striving to subdue the barbarians of England, Peru had civilized, settled forms of government.

Senator Hiram Bingham tells us that: "They succeeded in equalling the Egyptians in architecture, engineering, pottery and textiles. A highly-civilized people, artistic, inventive and capable of sustained endeavor, a race the destruction of whose annals was a calamity to mankind."

Humboldt writes as follows: "None of the Roman roads I have seen in Italy, France or Spain, appeared to be more imposing than those of the ancient Peruvians.

Was there any road in Europe two thousand miles long, or an aqueduct extending four hundred and fifty miles across sierras and over rivers? Are there any such today? Then

try to imagine a paved road from the North Sea to Constantinople before the 16th century!

However, this is not a history of the American races; and these examples are just cited in order to indicate the antiquity of the people whom the Castilians discovered, and to draw the attention of the reader to the culture they had attained—as old as any in Asia.

In a word, the Amerind rose high, unaided and alone. We make for him no unproved claims. From being a "Stone Age" man he rose to a very considerable height; but now he is at the bottom of life's hill, one of the "lesser breeds."

Although we cannot fill in the hiatus, we know that there were many intervening centuries—and that ages before Europe emerged from barbarism. The Amerind is old. Let us give him his due. The weight of all time since time began is upon his shoulders!

Whilst Egypt was situated at the very cross-roads of the ancient world, right in the heart of the stream of life, learning from east and west, north and south, the Amerind was alone and from his own unaided brain there evolved all he had.

Should we not, therefore, give him credit for his achievements? Is it right to ascribe his upward growth to outside influences and forever think that his culture was derived (in some never-explained way) from the Orient?

We do not claim that Peru was a Utopia. The student of history sees many and grave faults in its primitive government. The king and the priests were all-powerful and received all. Like Egypt and other ancient nations, the rulers were "semi-gods," and the priests taught a thousand superstitions.

In this we see an old humanity—as old as superstition itself. There is abundant evidence that Peru has been inhabited for many years—many thousands of years. Such evidence is overwhelming.

The plants of America bear evidences of longer cultivation than do those of Asia. "Teocintle" is a wild grass of

America, from which it is supposed that corn was evolved, though the vegetative "Missing Links" never have been found. That the Old World knew naught of corn, and the New World knew naught of wheat ought to be proof unanswerable that the two hemispheres were different worlds from the beginning. The motif of this book is that from vegetable to animal and up to man, all could readily be distinctly and separately *American*.

It is not our object unduly to exalt the ancient Americans, but rather to point out that theirs is a facet of the "diamond" of civilization that is frequently (almost invariably) ignored.

Let other writers expatiate on the glories of Egypt and Babylon, of Greece and of Rome. Our purpose is merely to direct the attention of the reader to the independent rise of glorious cultures on *this* hemisphere.

It is noteworthy that the gods of the Incas were good ones, while those of Mexico were demons!

The great array of food-stuffs and luxuries which we have inherited from the Amerind has already been referred to. Interesting as that list is, let us note how greatly it could have been augmented if the Peruvians had ever had relations with the Orient.

It is positively foolish to imagine emigrants coming from the Old World but having no knowledge of the wheat of Egypt, the rice of China and Japan, or the barley and oats of the Europeans! The fact that they were ignorant of the cereals just mentioned, and the further fact that they knew nothing of the horse, camel, ox, sheep, pig, dog, or poultry of the eastern hemisphere, are convincing proofs that there never had been any intercourse on their part with the Old World.

Post-Columbian Amerinds have eagerly "adopted" all of these things—just as we avidly utilize the Peruvian "potato"—now a "world-citizen!"

"Fans" of the "immigration" idea of the fictionist type may write all the stories that they please in order to bolster

up the age-old tradition; but Peru was settled and civilized probably just as early as any eastern country—and most assuredly before Europe left off its paint and wild animal skins. But why pile up further evidence? We believe we have adduced sufficient to prove our contention.

It has been stated (though not actually proved) that pottery has been found on the Pacific Coast of Peru with Chinese characters painted on it. If this is the case, it might well indicate that at some time or other a junk from the "Flowery Kingdom" had been cast ashore. However, one or two Oriental jars among the *thousands* of others found with letters *totally unlike* Chinese characters, are but a poor foundation on which to build a decision that Peru was settled by Chinese emigrants!

Indicating about the same degree of intelligence as that, the writer heard a radio speaker state that certain civilized South American Indians used a few Chinese words, and, "parrot-like," he wove into his speech the old idea of "descent." It's a pity the cobbler doesn't stick to his last! The truth is (as we happen to know about this particular case) that those Indians did not possess certain articles which the Chinese pedlars (of whom there are large numbers in South America) sold to them; and each new article, being unknown, was given a Chinese name! (In this connection it may not be irrelevant to mention that the well-known "Chop Suey" is not a Chinese dish at all, but an American one with a Chinese label!)

Some years ago, the author had occasion to take rice to a certain tribe, and found that they had no acquaintance whatever with such a cereal. They promptly dubbed it "the-thing-that-resembles the egg of the ant." As their word was so lengthy, we taught them to call it "rice." Upon hearing that familiar word, would the next traveller in that region be justified in pronouncing them "Anglo-Saxons?" Are *we Chinese* because we use the words "Chop Suey" for an American dish? Or are we *French* because we "park" our car overnight in a "garage?" Or because

we have calmly appropriated such words as "barrage," "camouflage," etc., etc.?

Upon such invalid and ill-founded claims has been reared the whole absurd superstructure concerning the Red Man's pedigree—based upon an *ex cathedra* ecclesiastical pronouncement of the 16th century, which was then accepted as "sacro-sanct" theology, and is still adhered to in many quarters.

At this point it is worthy of note as passing strange that a people who (suppositiously) travelled from one world to another should so have lost their "wanderlust" that we find them on the bleak uplands of Bolivia and Peru—where they had to build terraces in the mountain sides to hold sufficient earth to cover their seed—after travelling through six thousand miles of exceedingly rich and fertile lands on their (imagined) "trek" South! Why the "staircase" farms and the estates standing "on end?" Why the cities suspended between earth and heaven?

Note, further, that the Peruvians were ignorant of the existence of the Mexicans; and that the Aztecs were unaware of the fact that there was a rival nation in Peru. These strange facts are made abundantly clear by the chronicles of the Conquistadors, homologated by the fact that the Aztecs knew naught of the potato.

They were *parallel* but *not connected* cultures.

Oddly enough, the three great civilizations of the Old World were developed (the Egyptian in Africa; the Babylonian in Asia; and the Aeggean in Europe) while the twin Continents of America had their Mexican and Peruvian cultures. The three former borrowed from each other, while the American empires grew up and flourished strictly apart—a truly remarkable coincidence.

Rome is not the only "Eternal City." Cuzco may be much older than Rome.

"Civilization" and the "Christianity" of today do *not* go hand in hand, little as one likes to think so. To say that they do is the veriest fairy tale, as *our* brand of "Christi-

anity" is too distantly related to that taught by Jesus of Nazareth! It is earnestly hoped by this author that the savage tribe whereinto he was "adopted" some years ago may never become "civilized!"

Four hundred years of alien rule have rendered the Indian sullen. Whatever soul may be in his is extinguished.

The impact of European civilization has stunned him.

His people are as withered leaves clinging to a dead tree. They have had more centuries of living than have the aggressive intruders, and many things are beyond their ken. They are "played out." Time for them only reaches backward.

The Ketchua language does not lend itself to the expression of our thoughts; but they, in turn, do not learn the Spanish tongue.

How can *modern* Castilian words sound chords which have been muted for centuries? The Incan had quite a different philosophy of life which had worked on his soul too many centuries.

The Amerind cannot adapt himself to the changed conditions. He never could read or write. He cannot do so today. Spain saw to that.

He is a being apart. He constitutes a strange anomaly.

He has his dreams to dream, his hates to cherish. Never will he be reconciled.

Since the conquest he has been a slave, but unlike the African he makes a poor one. Too deeply has the iron entered his soul.

The Yellow Man of the East can readily adapt himself to new ways and profit thereby. He has always lived in the same world that we have, but the Amerind is of much too distinct a world and age for such adaptation. He is past understanding our way of life. Today we may find the natives furtively trudging to secluded spots in the Andes where some ancient god is carefully hidden away. They keep their own temple in their hearts and "bootleg" altars are numerous.

One cannot live any length of time amongst them without noting this old impulse to steal away to some secret cave where is concealed a stone god. The altars of their forefathers still draw them. Vain oblations, says the reader? Maybe not. This analyst believes in a God Who is behind the gods, and when lost Indians—their eye-pits red with the rust of centuries—bow and worship at the last lonely shrine of a faith whose flame their oppressors have been unable to trample out, the God of gods hears.

The plaster saints of the churches, with their white faces, Caucasian features, and with tinsel trimmings bedecked, do not appeal to them. They would rather still serve, with dumb devotion, the stone gods of their fathers. The *Encyclopedia Britannica* states that "The Church has had to extend its mantle over paganism which it could not extirpate."

Their "Pachacamac" was kinder to the Amerind than have been the "imported" gods. Perchance, in that sun which still rises as of yore, he is only sleeping and may yet awake. Whatever gods there be, the white man's God isn't attractive to the Amerind.

Yes, it is true that most of them "wear God around their necks" (a common expression for the scapular) and they pray to "Our Lady," but "Our Lady" is white and thus of the same race as the hated Conquistadores, and she has most assuredly been blind and deaf to their woes and wails. The old Russian God was the God of the nobility—he never helped the poor "mujik." Is it at all surprising that they should cast him out? They have never known true Christianity.

During the sojourn of the writer in Paraguay, it was a favorite "sport" of the better class people (so-called) who could afford to own high-powered rifles to cross to the west bank of the river and take "pot shots" at any savages they were fortunate enough to see! Of course, they never went near enough to be reached by the arrows of the aborigines! Is it to be wondered at, then, that when travelling on the

upper reaches of the Paraguay we always had to keep to the center of the stream? Is it strange that the Amerind sought revenge?

On one occasion the writer was a passenger on one of the river boats which carried *poisoned beans* to be given to the Indians at a certain point where it was proposed to establish a white settlement and port!

But then the British emigrants fed poisoned food to the old Tasmanians! It's true, the latter were scarcely human. Nevertheless, 2,000 years of *real* Christianity (*if embraced*) would have lifted us much too high for acts of such a nature.

O could their ancient Incas rise again,
 How would they take up Israel's taunting strain!
 Are thou too fallen, Iberia? Do we see
 The robber and the murderer weak as we?
 Thou that hast wasted earth and dared despise
 Alike the wrath and mercy of the skies,
 Thy pomp is in the grave, thy glory laid
 Low in the pits thine avarice has made.
 We come with joy from our eternal rest,
 To see the oppressor in his turn oppressed.
 Art thou the God, the thunder of whose hand
 Rolled over all our desolated land,
 Shook principalities and kingdoms down,
 And made the mountains tremble at his frown?
 The Word shall light upon thy boasted powers,
 And waste them as they wasted ours.
 'Tis thus Omnipotence his law fulfills,
 And vengeance executes what justice wills.

Cowper.

CHAPTER XVII

AN UNKNOWN PEOPLE IN AN UNKNOWN LAND

"Primeval race! — Their story
Who shall show?
They built, they reigned
They died — is all we know."

The Inca Kingdom extended over a region of country more than two thousand miles long, and everywhere the conquerors found evidences of a prior civilization of vast antiquity, a culture much older than the Incaic.

On the shores of Lake Titicaca, the highest body of water on the globe, stand sun-kissed and wind-swept pylons, erected in dim, far-off ages, by vanished human hands. What people built the stupendous edifices of Tiahuanaco we have no means of knowing. They have lost their very name in the mist of the past. Even the memory of them is gone forever.

The ruins were hoary with age before the Incas had settled around Titicaca. Bryce tells us that "they are extremely ancient, among the oldest known to mankind;—from very remote times."

Tiahuanaco, recognized as older than Thebes, is one of the great riddles of the universe. Mystery upon mystery, solutionless.

This pre-Inca city once was the home of myriads of people who have passed on. We can only imagine them, as we try to peer through the long telescope of unwritten history; but speaking anthropologically their carved faces are similar to those of the Indians of today.

In these ruins Professor Ross of Wisconsin University sees "an ancient city of a million inhabitants."

Charnay carefully measured one building and found it to be 2,000 ft. wide on each side! Dead glory of a city which now has only a past.

Grim old stone gods, which have survived the shock of ages, perpetually stare down the endless corridors of time; but they see not, neither do they understand. Their glory likewise is in the past.

The monoliths strangely remind one of "Stonehenge" in England and also of Easter Island in the Pacific. Certain it is that these are of very great antiquity and mysterious beyond all telling.

According to Montesinos in his "Memorias Peruanas," the Empire of the Incas dates back to 4,000 B.C.; but it is universally recognized that the Tiahuanaco civilization was much older.

Dr. Rudolf Mueller, the eminent German scientist, holds that Tiahuanaco, "The Place of the Dead Ones," is earth's oldest city. It has never been claimed that Egyptian history goes back more than 6,000 years, or that of Mesopotamia for more than 8,000 years. We know the names of their old cities; but the name which Tiahuanaco bore is forever lost.

In his *South America*, Bryce observes: "The most distinct and constantly-recurring impressions made by the remains is this: That the time when men began to rise out of mere savagery must, in these countries, be carried very far into the past." There must have been an immense accumulation of consistent and uninterrupted experience.

There has been an eternity of yesterdays—nay, an eternity of lost centuries. Human civilization is older than recorded history.

Their knowledge was old and they were a mature people before Tiahuanaco was builded—a heritage of ten thousand generations from the silence of their creation.

All the evidence points to a long-continued civilization. There was history before recorded history.

Yet we speak glibly of the "New" World!

When the modern railroad, which runs past the ruins of the city, was being constructed, the builders utilized 500 carloads of cut stones in the erection of nearby bridges; and thousands of tons of the sculptures and stone-work were crushed for ballast!

Many of the monoliths were found to be too massive for modern machinery to raise—so there they stand, where they were placed millenniums ago.

Desjardins states that "By reason of their character of religious grandeur and solitary majesty, they are comparable only with those of Karnac and Luxor."

How were they lifted and transported by those pre-Columbian builders?

Ask the stolid native who now makes his home in the ruins thereof, and he will inform you that legend states "the long dead ones" had learned how to hitch the moon to their weights—that the moon lifted those huge stones—but he cannot explain the process. Perhaps you smile and turn away—and then pause to think, "Well, but has not the moon the greatest lifting power in all nature? It raises millions of tons of tidewaters every day! *Could it be harnessed?*" "I cannot tell how the truth may be, I say the tale as 'twas told to me." Don't laugh. Many an old legend has some scientific basis.

It is commonly thought that these prehistoric people had learned the secret of levitation—that is to say, how to suspend the law of gravitation. "I can conceive of no known mechanism that could move such stones," says Hedges.

One can hardly imagine stones 32 ft. by 12 ft. by 6 ft. being lifted by human muscle-power alone! Nobody has ever explained how it was done or how it could be done!

At all events, a single stone, weighing 700 tons, was not quarried, carried and lifted by any other than "supermen."

A monolithic gateway—the largest known example of stone-cutting in the entire world—is hewn from a single massive block 13 feet 5 inches long and 7 feet 2 inches thick, the doorway being cut through the center. The

whole is crowned by deeply-cut designs, born in long-dead brains—and meant to signify what?

The cultures of what we call the Older World were greatly furthered by the use of draught animals and cattle. The sunset lands were not thus blessed. Bear in mind that America did not have any horses or wild cattle to be caught and tamed. There was no wild animal larger than the llama that lent itself to domestication.

The bronze indigenes, the *supposed* immigrants, perforce must use their brains to devise means to raise and haul loads such as were lifted and hauled by horses and oxen in the eastern hemisphere.

The ghostly builders of Tiahuanaco have returned to the dust whence they came, carrying these secrets with them.

There is evidence that they worked in iron, though hardened copper chisels are found not infrequently. Such relics conjure up visions of a strange lost life.

Were it not for the fact that we can now see and handle their works, we might almost doubt the very existence of these people.

That which men call "time" is forever past to these our geographical ancestors, who were the first Americans—a mysterious race of beings who were born apart and lived apart in a world of their own. Until 1492, their land was their own undisputed possession, as by divine gift.

Great as they must have been, they have not even passed into history.

There is a legend that these early people were the children of the first Adam and Eve who were created on the Island of the Sun in Lake Titicaca. On the sacred shores of this Island of lost memories walked their first parents, and to that Eden their descendants make pilgrimages.

Out of the unfathomable ages they came—had their day—and then melted into the unfathomable future. They sleep in the long night of forgetfulness.

"If a man die, shall he live again?"

Will the great Creator of the Sun-God revivify them?

Today only the innumerable shades of those who have passed on haunt the ruins. All that we have is the dim legends of a race whose glory has gone out in darkness, like the sundown of their tropical land.

Peru is a huge grave-yard of long-dead cultures. The many leagues of half-buried or wholly-buried ruins are mute memorials of those departed ones who have descended into utter oblivion.

The perfection of the buildings suggests a lengthy period of anterior development and a great degree of scientific knowledge.

As A Hyatt Verrill, in *Old Civilizations of the New World* states: "There is no doubt that these prehistoric American races far excelled every other race of their times in many ways."

The writer has tramped through the streets of long-buried Pompeii; but the houses and stores are little different from those we see in populated Italy, and thousands of Italians could move right in if permitted so to do.

To wander through these Peruvian ghost cities, with their unique and bizarre style, gives one a feeling of utter loneliness—of having been transported not only into another *era* but into a different dimension from our own!

In the northern part of Peru there are marvellous ruins to which have been given the name of "Gran Chimú." Here we find palaces, temples and tombs covering not less than twenty square miles!

Immense pyramidal buildings, some of them half a mile in circuit, show this to have been a place of great importance, having at least 100,000 souls—men and women of the younger world who now sleep the sleep of ages—but in their day they saw visions and dreamed dreams.

Those mighty builders have passed on. Will Kipling's "Master of all good workmen" "set them to work anew?"

Personally we would like to think that the old Mayan has not been utterly blotted out; that in some other life he is counting the stars or weighing the planets.

The ancient Peruvian could spend his eternity erecting mansions and hanging Pearly Gates. He would surely be an adept in laying golden streets in the Palace of the Sun!

The Itz-ama, Inti, Pachacamac or Great Spirit, whom we call God, is the same One Who reached down to meet them as they "stretched forth lame hands of faith" and groped towards Him.

Or, have they who came out of eternal stillness gone back into eternal stillness?

There were long, long dreams of ages, and many links of continuity before the man who lived in caves rose up to create the rhythm of Tiahuanaco.

It was a far cry from the primeval man to the imperious Atahualpa and the illustrious Guatemoc of Mexico City!

Mr. F. Hewitt Myring declares that "some of the ceramic specimens found in Chimu are so beautiful that experts on the subject of pottery say that nothing finer has been seen from the days of ancient Greece to the present"; and he continues: "Long before we had any knowledge of art in Europe, in that country now called Peru there existed an artistic, sensitive race, who wore elaborate clothing; and Peru was one of the most civilized parts of the earth."

Also Humboldt states: "There were civilized communities on the table-land who had a remarkable civil and religious organization, a Temple of the Sun built with stone columns, a regular system of computing time, a peculiar calendar, and who used small circular gold plates as coin."

Machu-Pichu, discovered by Senator Bingham, is the wonder city of the world; and Dr. Geisecke, of the University of Cuzco, says: "The surface has not yet been scratched, for many cities are likely to be discovered."

Near the present capital of Lima are the ruins of Pachacamac, the "City of God."

In ages long past, this was the "Mecca" of all Sun-worshipping people.

It was the abode of "Pachacamac," "He Who sustains or gives life to the Universe."

It was the place of oracles, the mystic shrine to which the Amerind went when in doubt or sorrow to learn the mind of his Creator as revealed by the powerful hereditary priests who spoke through the mouth of an image. Today, in obscure villages the Peruvians listen to the mind of God (they think) spoken through the carved lips of the Virgin Mary.

"No ruins in all South America, if indeed in the New World, hold more historic and romantic interest than those of the holy city of Pachacamac. No one can say when the city was first established; no man even can guess at its age. It may be five thousand, ten thousand years old." Scientific American.

Peru is a land of hidden secrets.

We here enter an infinity whose limits we cannot estimate.

Showalter, in the *National Geographic Magazine*, remarks: "It carries us back to a time of which only irresponsible legend dares speak with assurance; to a time before which more trustworthy tradition stands uncertain; to a time that was already too remote for memory when history wrote her first halting passages." Then he continues: "What stories Peru must have to tell of ages we hitherto have thought too remote for civilized human existence! And what new light upon the antiquity of man intensive search may yet reveal." The chronological gap is intriguing.

Man is very old, and undoubtedly most of his earliest work has long ago perished.

Thousands of years of jungle can bury man's edifices very deeply.

Where are the inhabitants of the many cities? Have they all melted away? Did some scourge drive them into Southern forests where they once more lapsed into barbarism?

Who and what are the savages of South America—those elusive dwellers in the dark jungles, with whom the author has travelled and among whom he has lived?

What are those homeless, naked, nomadic wanderers of the Bolivian Chaco, those baffling, silent humans, who have been described as "an unknown people in an unknown land?"

Butterworth has well described the Chaco (though of course only from hearsay) thus: "It is the great menagerie of the world, whose inhabitants are wild men and wild animals—a primitive world out of which there has been no evolution." It is the land of the four-legged bird—the crested "hoatzin"—the sole survivor of such a bird-species.

Some years ago it chanced to be the lot of the present author to be employed in opening up the Chaco region. Up till then the Amerind of that great zone of over two million square miles had not become acquainted with white men. The Chaco savages were wild and retiring. We found them living in the wood and bone age, but surprisingly intelligent as regards their own mode of living. They were marvellous hunters. Their sense of hearing was amazingly acute and their power of vision almost preternatural. In comparison with theirs, "our hearing is not hearing and our seeing is not sight!" However, we "civilized" creatures do not need to hear or see so keenly. Nature is good after all. A million years ago she provided us with ears, so that in these degenerate days of ours we might have something to hang our spectacles on!

The Chaco Indians were astonished at the deadly accuracy of our rifles, but obviously critical of our aim. They exulted greatly in the speed of our horses—an animal not before seen by them but of which they had heard. Unlike the aborigines found by Columbus, they did not regard us as superior beings at all! To them, we were but children intellectually! We knew *nothing* about *anything* that *mattered*! For instance, we could not stalk game—we got lost! Also we could not *smell water*! (which even our horses had to discover for us!). Furthermore, we stopped to gather fruits which even the *monkeys* knew to be *poisonous*!

Those Indians were absolutely truthful, honest and moral. In *that* sense they were "unspotted from the world"—the world of thieving and lying "Christian" races! They were socialists. When one of them shot a deer, they all ate—though it might have to be only meagrely. The miracles of the "five barley loaves and two fishes" was not repeated for their benefit. While they coveted our looking-glasses and knives, they held aloof from ourselves as though our coming boded evil for them. Had reports as to white dominance and greed previously reached them in some way? We think it probable, for armed scouts (frequently by us unseen) dogged our steps. If there had been any overt act of hostility on our part, ironwood-pointed arrows would have cut short our explorations then and there! Prior attempts to invade the Chaco had ended in failure.

They may have guessed, but we *knew* that from henceforth their hunting-grounds were passing into other hands.

All of this is several years ago, when the Chaco was "No-Man's-Land"—*any* man's land. Since that time, the Armies of Paraguay and Bolivia have battled for its possession—though the one getting it will be the loser. Not a kindly thought is bestowed on the original owners. On the contrary, poisoned food is given them to hasten their extermination!

Aeroplanes and machine-guns now rouse echoes in those primeval palm forests, and we who opened up the land are cursed as being the vanguard of evil. Now the Chaco is to be a land settled by white men. Thus what we call "civilization" marches on.

Somehow, in the glow of the camp fires, in those seemingly interminable palm forests, we could never look into the faces of those aborigines and regard them as undeveloped creatures. If there is "evolution," there is most assuredly also "devolution."

The Black fellows of Australia, the Maoris of New Zealand, the Fiji Islanders, whom we have watched keenly, seem to us to be children in intellect who may yet learn—

but by comparison the Amerind is *senile when he is born!*

Dr. Martius, the German ethnologist, thinks "the nations of the New World are not in a state of primitive barbarism or living in the original simplicity of uncultivated nature, "but that they are, on the contrary, "the last remains of a people once high in the scale of civilization and mental development, now almost worn out and perishing, and sunk into the lowest stage of decline."

Are the poor savages the descendants of those mighty builders?

"Devolution" is surer and more ruthless than "evolution!"

Nothing is more certain than retrogression.

All that blooms must fade.

Time, we are told, moves in a circle. The Nordic races at present face the sun.

The Amerind has long been in eclipse; but this first American antedated the Nordic rise by thousands of years.

The raven-haired Red Man was counting the stars while the flaxen-haired Norseman was still sunk in savagery.

The Amerind was among the most precocious of all the sons of men, whereas the synthetic Nordic was the last of the cycle to show his relationship to the Godhead.

Yes, the Red Man, in the infinite loneliness of his own separate "world," had a sunrise of civilization all his own, long, long ago.

Evidences of prehistoric life and labors are everywhere, but the men and women who reached out unto infinity in that far-distant past have gone back into the night.

As regards some of the facts of history, we might say "the first chapters have been torn out of the book," but regarding these aboriginal peoples, unfortunately we have to say that *all* the chapters and even the title-page have been torn out! Willard says: "The mystery lies not in the disappearance, rather, the unfathomable problem concerns their origin. Some day, perhaps, some deeply-buried record

will yield the secret, and this story without beginning may be completed."

The uncaring insensate forest has interred most of the works of those "dear dead days beyond recall."

The posterity of that same Amerind who in his palmy days rose and reigned, now sit with stolid apathy in the ruins of the past, listly and indifferent.

He who runs may piece together the story—darkness—a sign of dawn—the rising sun—a day of resplendent glory and light—finally a gloaming twilight and a setting sun.

Of the lives of the ancient Egyptians we know much, and we can read their history in a hundred volumes: but of the men of ancient Peru, we are as profoundly ignorant as we are of the (supposed) people in Mars! The crumbling ruins have no audible voice, but he is surely *stone-blind* who cannot see that this "America" of ours is verily an *old* world rather than a New World—comparatively recently resurrected as it were from the dead.

Four hundred years ago, a new, a fourth race of man was discovered. Four hundred years in the future, historians will tell incredulous students that a Red Race of mankind once existed and became extinct.

The Indians of today sit by the dying embers of the fire which illumined their pathway from the caves to the "Temple of a Thousand Columns," the solitary relic of a primeval age.

We started this book with the request that the reader should "weigh and consider" its contents.

So now, with this summation, thoughtful reader, "are you ready for the question?"

"You take your choice, as I'll take mine,
And hold it while your faith abets it.
Each philosophic system's fine
Until a later one upsets it!"





University of
Connecticut
Libraries



39153020782852

